DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 784 UD 018 421

TITLE The Forgotten Minority: Asian Americans in New York City.
INSTITUTION New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, New York.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 59p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; Chinese Americans; *Economic Opportunities; *Employment Opportunities; *Ethnic Stereotypes; Filipino Americans; Immigrants; Japanese Americans; Korean Americans; Laws; Mass Media; Racial Discrimination; Statistical Data; Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York); Social Security

ABSTRACT

Approximately 2.1 percent of New York City's population is Asian American. This report is concerned with the difficulties faced by members of the Chinese, Japanese, Filipino and Korean communities in the areas of immigration, employment, and as a result of media stereotyping of Asians. An overview of individual Asian communities in New York is presented, including brief histories and immigration statistics. Government policies, such as exclusion acts, regulation of visas for Asians, and the eligibility of immigrants for social security and public assistance, are reviewed. The employment of Asian Americans in New York is examined in terms of their representation in traditional and nontraditional industries. Statistics of Asian representation in restaurant, laundry and garment work, as well as in city and State government, the construction industry, and the health field, are presented. Government sponsored employment services and programs available locally to Asian immigrants are described. The effects of the stereotypic images of Asians projected by the media upon Asian American opportunities are described. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUL 5 1978

ED156784

The Forgotten Minority: Asian Americans in New York City

—A report prepared by the New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ATTRIBUTION:

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the New York State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission. This report has been prepared by the State Advisory Committee for submission to the Commission, and will be considered by the Commission in formulating its recommendations to the President and the Congress.

RIGHT OF RESPONSE:

Prior to the publication of a report, the State Advisory Committee affords to all individuals or organizations that may be defamed, degraded, or incriminated by any material contained in the report an opportunity to respond in writing to such material. All responses have been incorporated, appended, or otherwise reflected in the publication.

UD018421

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

NEW YORK STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
November 1977

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION
Arthur S. Flemming, *Chairman*
Stephen Horn, *Vice Chairman*
Frankie M. Freeman
Manuel Ruiz, Jr.
Murray Saltzman

John A. Buggs, *Staff Director*

Sirs and Madam:

The New York State Advisory Committee submits this report "The Forgotten Minority: Asian Americans in New York City," as part of its responsibility to advise the Commission on relevant civil rights problems within the State.

This report reviews the difficulties faced by the Asian American communities in immigration and employment. It also studies the problems faced by this minority group stemming from stereotyping in the media.

On July 11–13, 1974, the Advisory Committee held an informal, public hearings in New York City. Spokespersons from four Asian American communities—Chinese, Japanese, Pilipino, and Korean—discussed their concerns before the Advisory Committee. In addition, testimony was received from local, State, and Federal officials and representatives of the press, radio, and television.

New York City has a population of 7,894,862 persons. According to the Advisory Committee's estimate, approximately 2.1 percent of that population is Asian American. Yet, the Advisory Committee found that Asian Americans were underrepresented on the staffs of many State and city agencies and that (except for the Chinese) few programs were operated on their behalf by public and private agencies.

Testimony before the Advisory Committee suggested that Asian Americans experienced much of the social and economic exclusion which affects other minority Americans. For example, although they are represented in the labor force of New York City (as compared to their population) in greater ratio than any other ethnic group, many of them tend to be concentrated in low paying and unstable occupations.

On May 27, 1976, the New York State Advisory Committee invited representatives of several Asian American organizations to participate in a press conference at which time the Advisory Committee released a summary of its investigations into the problems of Asian Americans in New York City. At that time we stated some of the positive developments which had taken place since our informal public hearing of 2 years earlier. We said:

We hope that the release of this statement, and the subsequent release by the Commission of our report, will be important steps in creating an awareness among the citizens of this community of the unmet needs of the Asian American population, and will contribute to meaningful action by public and private agencies to meet those needs.

The Advisory Committee makes several recommendations in its report. We urge the Commission to support our recommendations and to assist this Advisory Committee in ensuring that these Americans can more fully participate in the mainstream of American life.

Respectfully,

Franklin H. Williams
Chairman

MEMBERSHIP
NEW YORK STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Hon. Franklin H. Williams, *Chairman*
New York

R. Val Archer, *Vice Chairman*
Syracuse

Domingo A. Garcia, *Vice Chairman*
Rochester

Dr. Setsuko Matsunaga Nishi, *Vice Chairwoman*
New York

Mary Jane Jaso, *Secretary***
New York

Samuel F. Abernethy**
New York

Luis Alvarez*
New York

Arnold T. Anderson**
Chappaqua

Dr. Samuel F. Babbitt
Clinton

Dr. John J. Beatty**
Brooklyn

Sandra L. Bird*
New York

Dr. Algernon Black**
New York

Sherman L. Brown**
New York

Minna R. Buck*
Syracuse

W. Haywood Burns*
New York

Dr. Walter Cooper
Rochester

Matilde P. DeSilva**
New York

Kathleen M. DiFiore
New York

Rita DiMartino
New York

Marshall C. England*
New York

Douglas P. Fields
New York

Hilda E. Ford*
Albany

L. Harriett Henderson*
West Hempstead

Sande R. Jones
New York

Dorothy A. Kirsch*
New York

Loida N. Lewis**
New York

Harold Lui*
New York

Francisco Lugovina**
Bronx

Tanya Melich**
New York

Prof. William M. Murphy*
Schenectady

Betty J. Powell**
Brooklyn

Calvin O. Pressley**
New York

Samuel Rabinove**
New York

Rarihokwats**
New York

Gladys E. Rivera**
Queens Village

Lillian Roberts**
New York

Steven H. Rubin*
Oneonta

Nancy O. Sachtjen**
Bronxville

Faith A. Seidenberg*
Syracuse

Ollie Scott
Buffalo

Ronnie B. Smith
New York

Rev. Antonio M. Stevens-Arroyo**
Jamaica

Lita M. Taracido
New York

Betty A. Tichenor**
Pittsford

Frieda Wallison*
New York

Charles P. Wang
New York

Robert Takashi Yanagida*
New York

Dr. Willie K. Yee*
Bronx

Asian American Subcommittee Members
R. Val Archer

Dr. Setsuko Matsunaga Nishi

Loida N. Lewis

Harold Lui

Gladys E. Rivera

Ronnie Smith

Frieda Wallison

Charles P. Wang

Robert Takashi Yanagida

Dr. Willie K. Yee

---

*No longer a member of the Advisory Committee.
**Appointed since the informal hearing.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective State on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Advisory Committee wishes to thank the staff of the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office, New York, N.Y., for its help in the preparation of this report. Research and writing assistance was provided by Eleanor Wong Telemaque, with assistance from Eliot Stanley and Gloria Sosa. Editorial assistance was provided by Linda Dunn, Research-Writer. Hester Lewis, Office of the General Counsel, Washington, D.C., provided legal counsel at the July 1974 informal public hearing and Eugene Bogan, Regional Attorney, provided legal review of the report. Additional staff support was provided by America Ortiz, with assistance by Diane Diggs and Victor Bracero. The report was prepared under the overall supervision of Jacques E. Wilmore, Regional Director.

Final production of the report was the responsibility of Deborah A. Harrison, Vivian Hauser, Audree Holton, Rita Higgins, and Vivian Washington, supervised by Bobby Wortman, in the Commission's Publications Support Center, Office of Management.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. An Overview of the Asian American 3
The Asian Experience 3
National Immigration Trends and Population Statistics 4
Asian Americans in New York City 5
The Chinese 5
The Japanese 8
The Koreans 12
The Pilipinos 14
3. Government Policies and the Asian Immigrant 16
Legacy of the Exclusion Acts 16
Visas for Asian Immigrants 17
Eligibility of Immigrants for Social Security and Welfare 18
4. Employment 22
The Asian Work Force 22
Traditional Industries 22
The Restaurant Industry 25
Laundries 25
The Garment Industry 25
Employment Services for Asian Workers 27
New York State Employment Service (NYSES) 27
The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act 27
New Areas of Employment 28
The Building and Construction Trades 28
State Government 29
New York City Government 29
Pharmacists 36
5. The Asian as a Stereotype 39
Asian Stereotypes 39
The Media and Stereotypes 39
The Broadcast Media 40
Theater 41
The Print Media 43
Findings and Recommendations 45

EXHIBITS

A. Immigration of Asians, 1971-73 6
B. Population of New York City by Race and Ethnicity, 1960 and 1970 7
C. Characteristics of the Chinese and the General Population in New York City, 1970 . 9
D. Characteristics of Selected Urban Japanese and the General Population in New York City, 1970 10
E. Characteristics of Selected Urban Koreans and the General Population in New York City, 1970 11
F. Characteristics of Selected Urban Pilipinos and the General Population, 1970 13
G. Employment of Asian Groups by Occupation in Selected Urban Areas, 1970 23
H. Occupational Classification of the Chinese in New York City, 1970 24
I. Asian Clients in New York City CETA and Other Employment Programs, Fiscal Year 1975 26
J. New York State Government Employees by Race, Ethnicity, and Job Category, 1974 26
K. Asian Americans in Selected State Agencies, 1974 30
L. New York City Labor Force, Occupational Classification by Race and Ethnicity, 1970 31
M. New York City Labor Force by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex, 1970 31
N. New York City Government Employees by Race and Ethnicity, 1971 33
O. Representation of Ethnic Groups by Job Category, New York City Government, 1971 33
P. Percentage of Minorities in New York City Agencies with 1,000 or More Employees 34
Q. Employment of Asian American Actors and Actresses in New York City Theater, 1968-73 42
R. New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, Effect of Work Force Reductions Since July 1, 1975, on Employees 35

APPENDIX

Jonn L. S. Holloman, Jr., President, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, letter to Jacques Wilmore, Jan. 12, 1977 49

Chapter 1

Introduction

Asian Americans are a forgotten minority in the New York City area. They suffer much of the social deprivation and economic discrimination experienced by other minority Americans, but often their plight has been ignored by Federal, State, and local agencies responsible for providing services to all Americans.

In 1974 the New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights undertook a study of selected problems related to the civil rights of Asian Americans[1] in New York City. The study, conducted by the Asian American Subcommittee under the leadership of Dr. Willie Kaiming Yee, included a review of problems confronting Asians in immigration, employment, and stereotyping in the media. The study gained impetus through the support of Asian American groups, such as Asians for Equal Employment, Asian Americans for Action, Asians for a Fair Media, and the Asian American Caucus. These groups began publicly to protest the lack of equal opportunity for Asians in manpower training and other social service programs, the underrepresentation of Asians in public and private employment, their portrayal in the media, and the inadequate funding by local, State, and Federal Governments.

Advisory committee members and Commission staff collected information on four Asian groups in New York: Chinese, Japanese, Pilipinos, and Koreans, and conducted interviews with Asian community leaders, public officials, and concerned citizens. An informal, public hearing was held in New York City, June 12–14, 1974.[2] This hearing, believed to be the first governmental forum held in the city on Asian Americans, gave Asian groups the opportunity to express their perceptions of problems that denied them equal opportunity.

As an additional source of information, subcommittee members reviewed several studies on Asian Americans. The most comprehensive analysis of Asian groups is *A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities* conducted by Urban Associates, Inc., for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).[3] Additional studies are Betty Lee Sung's *Chinese Americans: Manpower and Employment*, a study funded by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL);[4] the *Asian American Field Study* funded by HEW;[5] and Chia-Ling Kuo's dissertation on the Chinese of Chinatown, an anthropological study to be issued by the Ford Foundation.[6] Subcommittee members and Commission staff also obtained other papers from students and community groups which detailed the exclusion of Asian Americans from existing Government programs and funds.[7] Most of these reports were based on questionnaires and door-to-door head counts.

Most of the available socioeconomic data are on the Chinese population. For instance, the Betty Lee Sung and Chia-Ling Kuo studies were limited to the Chinese. Although the Urban Associates and the Asian American Field Study reports cover the Japanese, Pilipinos, Koreans, and the Chinese, these studies do not always include data on specific Asian groups in New York City.

Indeed, one of the overriding concerns of the Koreans, the Japanese, and the Pilipinos who testified before the Advisory Committee was the lack of available factual information on their groups in New York City. These witnesses strongly urged that private and government institutions conduct studies of their communities.[8]

Notes to Chapter 1

1. In this report, the term "Asian" and "Asian American" are used interchangeably.

2. New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Transcript of Public Hearing, June 12–14, 1974, New York City, N.Y. (hereafter cited as Transcript). Available in the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office (NERO).

3. Urban Associates, Inc., *A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics* (July 1974). Study based on the 1970 census and funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Urban Associates is now known as R.J. Associates, Inc.

4. Betty Sung Lee, *Chinese American Manpower and Employment* (1975). A report prepared for the Manpower Administration (renamed the Employment and Training Administration in

November 1975) of the U.S. Department of Labor under research and development grant no. 21-36-73-13.

5. Chi-Wing Ho, "Some of the Findings of the National Asian American Field Study to the New York Advisory Committee." The study received funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Available in NERO files.

6. Chia-Ling Kuo, *The Chinatown Exploratory Project* (New York: Praeger Press, 1976).

7. These papers include: George Yuzawa, "The Japanese Aging in New York, New York" (1975); Tino Calabia, Tania Azores, and Angela Cruz, "Report on Pilipinos in New York City" (1974); Irving Chin, Project Proposal (1973); and M.B. Lee, "Findings of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association Study on Asian Americans in New York, N.Y." (1975).

8. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 114–19, 150–53, and 160–64.

Chapter 2

An Overview of the Asian American

An overview of the Asian American population will be presented in this section in alphabetical order: the Chinese, the Japanese, the Koreans, and the Pilipinos.

The Asian Experience

The experience of the Asians in the United States is similar in many ways to the experience of black Americans. Historically, although they were not legally enslaved, Asians were deprived of many legal and civil rights. Those who were admitted as residents in this country were often victims of racial hatred and discrimination. Others were prohibited on the basis of race from coming into the United States. While the treatment of blacks and other racial minorities often reflected social and economic conditions in the country, the experience of Asians often reflected American foreign policy. For instance, many Americans are familiar with the sordid and shameful history of the internment of Japanese Americans during the early days of World War II. Dr. Michio Kaku, chairman of Asians for a Fair Media, remembers those years:

> The entire Japanese-American population on the West Coast, citizens as well as noncitizens, were given short notice (often***24 hours) to get rid of their personal belongings. Japanese Americans had all their bank savings confiscated, lost virtually all their real estate holdings, were deprived of their civil rights.[1]

The Chinese, the first Asians to be excluded, were restricted from entering the country as early as 1882.[2] The Japanese escaped the first exclusion act through the so-called "gentleman's agreement" in which the Japanese Government agreed with the United States to limit the immigration of Japanese nationals to this country.[3] In 1924 Congress passed a law that prohibited the immigration of Japanese to this country.[4] This policy was extended to cover Pilipinos in 1934 with the passage of the so-called Philippine Independence Act.[5] Because China was an ally of the United States in World War II, Chinese were granted the right to citizenship in 1943.[6] The Japanese, however, were not granted that right until 1952.[7]

The confusion continues to this day. There is still no consistent policy at most levels of government mandating the same treatment for all Asian groups and equal treatment with other minority groups. Until the recent Supreme Court decision in *Hampton v. Mow S. Wong*, a Pilipino alien who held residency in the United States was permitted to hold a competitive position with the Federal Government; a Japanese, Korean, or Chinese alien with similar residency was not.[8]

There is also no consistent policy of classifying Asians. All Asians do not "look alike" nor are their heritages the same. Yet the distinction among Asian groups is not considered for enumeration. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), for example, lumps all Asians together in the enumerations it requires from public and private employers.[9] The Census Bureau enumerates Japanese, Chinese, Pilipinos, Koreans, and Hawaiians separately. Guamanian, Samoan, Malayan, Polynesian, and Thai are categorized as "other."[10]

In New York the nomenclature varies in different State and city authorities. The New York State Department of Civil Service classifies all Asians simply as "Asians."[11] The New York State Department of Employment places Asians in the category of "other."[12] In the most recent ethnic survey of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, Chinese were classified separately and Japanese and other Asians were placed in the category of "Other minorities."[13]

Asians, other than the Chinese, are completely ignored in many funding programs for minority groups. In New York State, no Pilipino, Japanese, or Korean group has ever received municipal or State funds.[14] In New York City no Asian group received any of the so-called "ethnic grants." White ethnic groups which received funds under this program (which is now defunct) included

HANAC (a nonprofit Greek organization); the Metropolitan Coordinating Council on the Jewish Poor; the Congress of Italian-American Organizations; the Council of Belmont Organizations (a mostly Italian group in the Bronx); and the Polish and Slovak Center in the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn.[15]

The Emergency School Aid Act of 1970,[16] sponsored by Senator Jacob A. Javits of New York, is an example of what public and private policy should be with respect to the funding of aid programs. The act states:

> The term "minority group" refers to (1) persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portuguese, Oriental, Alaskan natives, and Hawaiian natives***and***as determined by the Assistant Secretary, persons who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers and cultural differences, do not have equal educational opportunity***.[17]

By defining minority groups specifically to include Asian Americans, the act permits these groups to receive funds for educational programs and provides Asians the right to seek judicial relief if they are illegally denied participation in such programs.

National Immigration Trends and Population Statistics

In 1970 the official population count of the United States was 203,211,926. Of this total, 2,089,932 or 1.03 percent were identified as Americans of Chinese, Pilipino, Hawaiian, Korean, and Japanese descent, and those categorized as "Other."[18] The "Other" category included Guamanian, Samoan, Malayan, Polynesian, Thai, etc.

The Chinese who came to this country in the early 1800s were the first Asian group to come to the United States. In the middle of the 19th century, following the Taiping Rebellion in China, thousands of Chinese laborers were recruited to work the gold mines of California. To this day, many Chinese Americans refer to the United States as "Gim-San,"[19] the "Golden Mountain." In the second half of the 1800s—the period that historian Mary Coolidge calls "Free Immigration"—approximately 10,000 Chinese were brought to this country to help build the Transcontinental Railroad.[20]

Japanese laborers immigrated to Hawaii in 1894 under contract with Hawaiian sugar plantation owners. Because of the Oriental Exclusion laws, Japanese immigration was limited until the United States annexed Hawaii at the turn of the century. At that time, according to testimony by Rev. Alfred J. Akamatsu, executive director of the Japanese Mutual Aid Society of New York, there were 27,440 Japanese in the country.[21] In 1907 the United States prohibited the immigration of Japanese to the United States through Hawaii, Mexico, and Canada.[22] In 1908 the Japanese Government signed the "gentlemen's agreement" with the United States to limit new immigrants.[23] In 1924 the Federal Immigration Act was passed which put an absolute bar on Japanese immigration.[24]

Unlike the Chinese and the Japanese, Koreans did not come to this country in large numbers until after 1960. In 1970, the first year that Koreans were enumerated as a separate ethnic group in the census, there were 69,510 in the U.S.; Koreans were then the fifth largest Asian American subgroup in the United States.[25] According to the Urban Associates Study, the Korean population settled throughout the United States, but one-half of all Koreans born in the United States live in the West.[26]

The first major immigration of Pilipinos followed the Spanish-American War when Spain ceded the Philippines, along with Puerto Rico and Guam, to the United States. Pilipino men were recruited to work the sugar plantations in Hawaii and the farmlands of the San Joaquin and Imperial Valleys in California. These migratory farm laborers established Pilipino settlements or "Manila Towns" in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Stockton, Delano, Los Angeles, and elsewhere in the farmlands along the West Coast.[27]

The Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 established a Philippines Commonwealth and provided for independence in 1946.[28] The United States national quota laws applied to countries with commonwealth status and limited Pilipino immigration to 50 persons a year. When the Philippines became an independent state in 1946, the annual immigration quota for the Philippines was raised to 100. Many of the Philippine Scouts[29] who had fought

alongside American troops in World War II migrated to the United States and later sent for their families. As an inducement to Pilipino immigration, the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 granted nonquota immigrant status to Philippine citizens who had resided in the United States for a continuous period of 3 years prior to November 30, 1941. The nonquota status was also granted to their spouses and unmarried children under 18 years of age.[30]

Prior to 1964 immigration quotas for Eastern Hemisphere countries prevented large-scale Asian immigration to the United States. The national origins quota system permitted groups to immigrate according to their representation in the population in 1920. Thus, the major share of the allocations went to those countries who were racially and ethnically close to the majority population—the Western Hemisphere countries.

Reform legislation in 1965 eliminated discriminatory quota provisions and opened up Asian immigration to the United States.[31] As a result, immigration from Asia and the Pacific increased rapidly. The Chinese population grew from 237,292 (or 0.1 percent of the total) in 1960 to 435,062 (0.2 percent) in 1970, an increase of 83.3 percent. The Japanese population grew from 464,332 (0.3 percent) to 591,290 (0.3 percent) in 1970, an increase of 27.4. The Pilipino population grew from 176,310 (0.1 percent) to 343,060 (0.2 percent). This increase of 94.9 percent is the highest growth rate of any racial or ethnic group enumerated separately by the census.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 established three major categories of immigrants: the immediate relatives of United States citizens, natives of Eastern Hemisphere countries and their dependencies, and "special" immigrants, comprised primarily of natives of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. The act also established preferences for specified relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens[32] and established two preferences for persons with specific occupational qualifications, including professionals and skilled and unskilled workers.

Immigration continues to play a large role in the growth of Asian American communities in the United States. Exhibit A indicates the immigration of Asian ethnic groups from 1971 through 1973. Koreans are the second largest Asian group immigrating to the United States and the group with the largest rate of increase since 1970.

Asian Americans in New York City

According to the census, there were 7,894,862 persons living in New York City in 1970. Among these were 69,324 (0.9 percent) Chinese, 13,698 (0.2 percent) Japanese, 11,207 (0.1 percent) Pilipinos, and 4,685 (0.1 percent) Koreans (see exhibit B). The Chinese population had grown from 32,831 in 1960, a growth rate of 111.1 percent. The Japanese in New York increased by 133 percent and the Pilipinos by 161.6 percent. The Commission estimates that the 1970 census undercounted ethnic groups by at least 7 percent;[33] therefore, it is assumed that the total Asian population was at least 179,734 or 2.1 percent of the total.

As indicated in exhibit A, Asians, particularly Koreans and Pilipinos, have continued to immigrate to the United States at a very fast rate since 1970. The New York City Planning Commission estimates that the number of Koreans, Pilipinos, and other Asian Americans in New York City has doubled since 1970, and that the Chinese population has increased by at least 25 percent.[34] Based on the increase, the Asian population (or nonwhites excluding blacks, Puerto Ricans, other Spanish-speaking persons and American Indians) was estimated to be 2.9 percent in 1975.[35] That figure does not take into account the higher birth rate of these Asian groups or the number of aliens in New York City whose status has not yet been legalized.[36] One further indication of the increase in the Asian population since 1970 is the increase in the students classfied as "Oriental" in the public elementary schools. According to the planning commission, the number of Oriental elementary school students increased from 9,945 in 1970 to 11,821 in 1973, an increase of 18.9 percent in 3 years.[37]

The Chinese

Traditionally, the Chinese in New York City have settled along Mott Street and the surrounding areas on the lower east side. At the turn of the century, the Chinese lived only in Chinatown. This 15-block area was inhabited by many "extended families" and served to help newly arrived im-

EXHIBIT A
Immigration of Asians, 1971–73

Place of birth	China, Taiwan & Hong Kong	Japan	Philippines	Korea	Other Asia*	Total
Population according to 1970 census	435,000	591,000	343,000	70,000	224,000	1,663,000
Immigration since 1970						
1971	17,600	4,500	28,500	14,300	14,000	78,900
1972	21,700	4,800	29,400	18,900	19,400	94,200
1973	21,700	5,500	30,800	22,900	15,600	96,500
Total	61,000	14,800	88,700	56,100	49,000	269,600
Percent Increase **	14	3	26	80	22	16

* Includes Southeast Asia and Oceania. Does not include Western Asia (the Middle East), South Asia, Australia, or New Zealand

** Percent increase can only be taken as a low estimate, as immigration data do not take into consideration Asian aliens residing in the U.S. whose visa status is that of non-immigrant, but subject to change.

Source: Urban Associates Study.

EXHIBIT B

Population of New York City by Race and Ethnicity, 1960 and 1970

Population group*	1960	Percent	1970	Percent	Percent Change
White	6,670,662	85.7	6,480,841	82.1	2.8
Black	1,087,931	14.0	1,688,115	21.4	+55.2
Chinese	32,831	0.4	69,324	0.9	+111.1
Japanese	5,991	0.1	13,968	0.2	+133.1
Pilipinos	4,281	0.1	11,207	0.1	+161.6
Indians	3,262	**	9,930	0.1	+204.4
Koreans ***	N.A.	N.A.	4,685	0.1	+945.8
Others	7,026	0.1	68,792	0.9	
Total	7,781,984		7,894,862		

* Data on Spanish-speaking background persons are not included in this chart because table 23 enumerates Spanish-speaking as either black or white.

** Less than 0.1 percent.

*** Data on Koreans are from the Urban Associates Study.

N.A. = Not available.

Source: U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population, Vol. I, *Characteristics of the Population*, New York, table 23.

migrants by providing a cultural buffer with linguistic and dietary familiarities. There is a popular Chinese saying, "Mott Street belonged to 'On Leong' while Pell Street belonged to 'Hip Sing'," two extended families.

The population was predominantly Cantonese, with the majority speaking the Toy-san Sze-yup dialect. Most early Chinese immigrants could trace their ancestral homes to the Pearl River Delta in Kwangtung Province, China. These first immigrants were a population of lonely sojourners—men who came without their wives and families because of immigration regulations.[38]

In 1960 approximately 4,000 of the 32,000 Chinese in New York City lived in Chinatown.[39] With reform of the immigration laws, many new immigrants came to Chinatown. The Chinese began moving into surrounding areas—to the Bowery, Chatham Square, along East Broadway, and into Little Italy. In 1970 the Chinatown population had increased to 24,000.[40]

Today the children of the first immigrants have become "Americanized." As with all ghetto populations, many second-generation Chinese, confident in English and losing the cultural values of the Pearl River Valley, have moved into other areas of the city. There is a growing Chinese population around Columbia University in Manhattan, Sunnyside in Queens, Flatbush in Brooklyn, and Great Neck, Long Island.

There are no accurate statistics on the number of Chinese now entering New York City. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) reports indicate that more Chinese are coming to New York City than to any other locality in the country, and that three times as many Chinese immigrants enter New York City as compared to San Francisco.[41]

The Chinese in New York City are poorer and less educated than the general population in New York (see exhibit C). Because a relatively high number of families have two or more "rice winners," the income of Chinese families is not significantly different from the general population. According to the 1970 census, 47 percent of Chinese men and 61 percent of Chinese women in New York earn less than $4,000, while 16 percent of Chinese families earn at that rate. About 15 percent of Chinese families are below the poverty level, but only 3.4 percent of these families receive public assistance. Among the Chinese elderly, about 31 percent are poor. The Chinese in Chinatown are poorer than those living elsewhere in New York City. According to the Asian American Field Study (which provides data only on Chinatown), 68 percent of all families in the survey earned below the poverty level.[42] Of those low-income families covered in the Asian American Field Study, more than half (62.1 percent) had older immigrants who had come to the United States before 1965.[43] Forty-three percent of the immigrants over the age of 60 worked full time; of those, 20 percent worked for more than 57 hours a week.

For the Chinese increased education does not mean a commensurate increase in income. The Urban Associates Study shows that the ratio of Chinese men earning $10,000 or more to those with a college degree falls "far behind" the general population.[44] Betty Lee Sung, director of the Asian Studies program at City College in New York, confirmed this pattern. Many Chinese who hold postgraduate degrees, she told the Advisory Committee, often earn less than their white or black counterparts.[45]

The Japanese

Very little is known about the early Japanese community in New York City. The Japanese Mutual Aid Society of New York, organized in 1907, was the first self-help group to provide services to Japanese residents. In 1931 Japanese in New York founded the Tozai Club to assist Japanese in finding jobs. In 1941, with the outbreak of World War II, Japanese citizens as well as aliens lost almost all civil and legal rights. Many Japanese in New York City and throughout the country were apprehended by the FBI and placed in concentration camps.[46]

Rev. Alfred Akamatsu told the Advisory Committee:

> When the Pacific War broke out on December 7, 1941, I was promptly apprehended by FBI agents on the ground that I was a "potentially dangerous enemy alien" and held on Ellis Island along with some other 350 people***.One of the judges asked me, "Is there anything you would like to say"***."Yes," I said, "***there are some people detained, all of them long residents of this country, absolutely loyal to democracy, but they are detained as enemy aliens because to them the rights of naturalization had not

EXHIBIT C

Characteristics of the Chinese and the General Population in New York City, 1970

	Percent Chinese	Percent general population
Labor force		
Male	70.9	74.1
Female	50.5	42.2
Unemployed		
Male	2.5	3.9
Female	2.9	4.6
Poverty		
Men with incomes less than 4,000	47.0	N.A.
Women with incomes less than 4,000	61.0	N.A.
Families with incomes less than 4,000	16.0	15.6
Families below Federal poverty level	15.0	11.5
Families on public Assistance	3.4	9.7
Families on social security	14.0	20.9
Persons 65 and over below Federal poverty level	31.0	17.7
Education		
8 years or less	49.0	29.3*M/31.0F
High school graduates	44.0	45.0*M/50.1F
College graduates	15.0	23.0*M/15.0F

* Include all persons 25 years and over.

N.A. = Not available.

Source: Urban Associates Study and U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population.

EXHIBIT D
Characteristics of Selected Urban Japanese and the General Population in New York City, 1970

	Percent Japanese *	Percent general population
Labor Force		
Male	76.3	74.1
Female	40.4	42.2
Unemployed		
Male	2.5	3.9
Female	4.6	4.6
Poverty		
Men with incomes less than $4,000	35.0	N.A.
Women with incomes less than $4,000	65.0	N.A.
Families with incomes less than $4,000	16.0	15.6
Families below Federal poverty level	11.0	11.5
Families on public assistance	2.9	9.7
Families on social security	20.0	20.9
Persons 65 and over below Federal poverty level	26.0	17.7
Education		
Men		
With 8 years or less	13.0	29.3**
High school graduates	73.0	45.0
College graduates	30.0	23.0
Women		
With 8 years or less	14.0	31.1
High school graduates	69.0	50.1
College graduates	13.0	15.0

* Includes all Japanese Americans in the United States in areas other than Hawaii and California. Data not available for New York City alone.

** Include all persons 25 and over.

N.A. = Not available.

Source: Urban Associates Study and U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population.

EXHIBIT E
Characteristics of Selected Urban Koreans and the General Population in New York City, 1970

	Percent Koreans	Percent general population
Labor Force		
Male	79.0	74.1
Female	41.0	42.2
Unemployed		
Male		3.9
Female		4.6
Poverty		
Men with incomes less than $4,000	24.0	N.A.
Women with incomes less than $4,000	46.0	N.A.
Families with incomes less than $4,000	N.A.	15.6
Families below Federal poverty level	N.A.	11.5
Families on public assistance	N.A.	9.7
Families on social security	N.A.	20.9
Persons 65 and over below Federal poverty level	N.A.	17.7
Education		
Men with 8 years or less	13.0	29.3 *M*/31.1*F*
High school graduates	81.0	45.0 *M*/50.1*F*
College graduates	53.0	23.0 *M*/15.0*F*

* Include all persons 25 years and over.

* Includes all Koreans in urban areas outside of Hawaii and California. Data not available for New York City alone.

Source: Urban Associates Study and U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population.

been accorded***.I pray that in the future, the people from the Far East***the Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, and Pilipinos will enjoy the rights of naturalization just like all other people***."[47]

Japanese are more dispersed in New York City than they are in Los Angeles or San Francisco. Although there is no "little Tokyo" in New York, almost half the Japanese population in New York City (44 percent) lives in the borough of Queens.[48]

Most Japanese in New York City are not permanent residents of the United States, but are nationals employed in more than 100 Japanese firms in the metropolitan area. These firms include such well known names as Toyota, Takashimaya, Honda, and the Sony Corporation. Of the more than 50,000 Japanese working in New York, it is estimated that between 5,000 and 6,000 are permanent residents.[49]

Data on Japanese Americans in New York are not included in the Urban Associates Study; however, data are presented on Japanese living in areas other than Hawaii and California, the two areas with the largest concentration of Japanese. For lack of other data, the Advisory Committee is using data on these Japanese to describe Japanese in New York City.

With the exception of the Japanese elderly, these Japanese Americans earn about the same income as the general population in New York. As shown in exhibit D, 16 percent of Japanese families earn less than $4,000 a year and 11 percent are below the poverty level. About 73 percent of the Japanese men and 69 percent of Japanese women have completed high school, and 30 percent of Japanese men have completed college, percentages well above the general population in New York City and other areas. Relatively few Japanese families (2.9 percent) receive public assistance.

In May 1972 an ad hoc committee of concerned Asians of New York was formed to evaluate the needs of the Japanese senior citizens. The committee included representatives of Asian Americans for Action, the Asian American Association of New York City (Triple A), Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), New York chapter of the Japanese United Church, the New York Buddhist Church, and the Niko Club. The committee commissioned Professor K. Asumi of Columbia University to conduct a survey of local Japanese Americans 50 years and older living in New York City. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sampling of these 1,350 elderly citizens; approximately 18 percent responded. The poll indicated a major need for a senior citizens home for these Japanese-speaking elderly.[50]

George Yuzawa, chairman of the committee (now called Japanese Americans for the Aging), said in an interview that "The Japanese as a group are ignored. There is no funding by city or State specifically earmarked for the elderly Japanese."[51]

Tomi Ogata, a nutritionist with the New York City Department of Health, described the problems facing many elderly Japanese Americans. The language barrier, she said, often kept them from learning about public social services. "The history of discrimination and oppression has made many elderly distrustful of American Government," Ms. Ogata said.[52] "Most of these elderly are poor. They are living on limited incomes. Many of them lost their properties in California and lived in internment camps. They do not wish to return to Japan as they are Americans."[53]

The Koreans

There is little data available on Koreans in New York City. However, in New York as elsewhere, Koreans are immigrating at a faster rate than many other Asian groups.[54] Many of these immigrants include families with young children.

According to the Bureau of the Census, there were 4,684 Koreans in the city in 1970. Between 1970 and 1973, an additional 4,799 Koreans immigrated to the city (an increase of 102.4 percent). According to the Urban Associates Study, the "very sharp increase in Korean immigration in the three years since the 1970 census has resulted in major changes in population which may severely limit the validity of the 1970 data."[55] Joseph Ryu, a Korean social worker, testified, "We may conservatively estimate Koreans in New York as around 15,000 by adding (to the 1970 census figure) the 13 percent increase in Korean immigrants noted by the United States immigration in the last 3 years."[56]

One problem cited by representatives of the Korean community is the poverty of many Koreans. The 1970 census showed that 24 percent of Korean women earn less than $4,000 (see exhibit

EXHIBIT F
Characteristics of Selected Urban Pilipinos and the General Population in New York City, 1970

	Percent Pilipinos	Percent general population
Labor Force		
Male	83.1	74.1
Female	61.0	42.2
Unemployed		
Male	4.7	3.9
Female	3.2	4.6
Poverty		
Men with incomes less than $4,000	39.0	N.A.
Women with incomes less than $4,000	47.0	N.A.
Families with incomes less than $4,000	16.1	15.6
Families below Federal poverty level	11.0	11.5
Families on public assistance	3.1	9.7
Families on social security	11.0	20.9
Persons 65 and over below Federal poverty level	24.0	17.7
Education		
Men		
With 8 years or less	17.0	29.3**
High school graduates	67.0	45.0
College graduates	29.0	23.0
Women		
With 8 years or less	14.0	31.1
High school graduates	73.0	50.1
College graduates	44.0	15.0

* Includes all Pilipinos in urban areas outside of Hawaii and California. Data are not available for New York City alone.

** Include all persons 25 years and over.

N.A. = Not available.

Source: Urban Associates Study and U.S., Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population.

E). Other concerns include the large number of non- or limited-English-speaking war brides who are now divorced,[57] and the significant number of Korean women who had immigrated to the U.S. to support their families in Korea and are unable to find work.[58]

The Pilipinos

Little is known about the early Pilipinos in New York City. Pilipino men immigrated to the United States more than 50 years ago and worked as sailors and in nonskilled industries. Tino Calabia, chairperson of the Asian American Caucus, noted:

> They came to America in the late 1920's and 1930's when the immigration laws prevented them from bringing their wives; miscegenation laws forbade them from marrying white women***in New York, these *manongs* (older brothers) are likely to be ex-sailors, retired barbers, living on fixed incomes near the docks of South Brooklyn.[59]

Since reform of the immigration laws in 1965, many Pilipinos with professional skills have come to New York through occupational preferences. This immigration pattern was documented for the Advisory Committee by a coalition of Pilipino groups who analyzed selected community planning districts in the city to provide information which was not otherwise available. Lalut Valte, a representative of the coalition, said many professional Pilipinos in the city now live near hospitals and areas near the United Nations, where many of them work.[60]

Because data on Pilipinos in New York City are not available in the Urban Associates Study, statistics on Pilipinos living in all urban areas outside of Hawaii and California are used in this report. (See exhibit F).

About 16 percent of the Pilipino families earn less than $4,000 and a relatively small percentage of these families (3.1) receive public assistance. A high percentage (24 percent) of the Pilipino elderly are poor.

The Pilipinos have a relatively high educational level. About 67 percent of the men and 73 percent of the women are high school graduates, and 29 percent of the men and 44 percent of the women have had 4 years of college or more. Information gathered by the coalition of Pilipino groups substantiates the high level of education. According to Lalut Valte, about 91.7 percent of the children between the ages of 5 and 17 are in school; of the Pilipinos between the ages of 25 and 34, 73.4 percent are high school graduates, and 52.4 percent have had 4 years of college or more.[61]

Notes to Chapter 2

1. New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Transcript of Public Hearing, June 12–14, 1974, New York City, N.Y., vol. I, p. 202 (hereafter cited as Transcript). Available in the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office (NERO) files.

2. Act of May 6, 1882 (commonly known as the Chinese Exclusion Act, 22 Stat. 58). For an account of early American attitudes toward the Chinese, see Stuart Creighton Miller, *The Unwelcome Immigrant: The American Image of the Chinese, 1785–1882* (Los Angeles, 1969).

3. Rose Hum Lee, *The Chinese in the United States of America* (London University Press, 1960), p. 41. See also E.K. Strong, *The Second-Generation Japanese Problem* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1934), p. 160.

4. Immigration Act of 1924, 43 Stat. 153; 8 U.S.C.§201.

5. 48 Stat. 456. (1934).

6. Act of Dec. 17, 1943. To repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, 57 Stat. 600; 8 U.S.C.§262–97.

7. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, 8 U.S.C.§1101 *et seq.* (corresponds to the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, 66 Stat. 163)

8. See Hampton v. Mow S. Wong, 96 S. Ct. 1895 (1976). The U.S. Civil Service Commission had a regulation (5 C.F.R. 338.101) which stated that an individual had to be a citizen to be appointed to competitive service. The Supreme Court decision now permits resident aliens to apply for Federal employment. The original lawsuit was filed by five San Francisco Chinese aliens in 1971. For more information, see *East/West, The Chinese-American Journal*, Feb. 6, 1974. For information on Pilipino exemption to the citizenship requirement, see Federal Personnel Manual, chap. 300, sub. chap. 11, pp. 23–24 (March 1976). See also Pub. L. 94–212, Feb. 9, 1976.

9. U.S., Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Employer Information Report, EEO Forms 1–5.

10. For more information on racial group data collected by the Census Bureau, see *Characteristics of the Population, 1970 Census of Population, Part 1 United States Summary*, vol. I, sec. 2, appendix B.

11. New York State Civil Service Commission, *1974 Annual Report on the Occupation, Job Status and Ethnic Characteristics of Employees in New York State Agencies.*

12. Richard Kane, director, New York City Office, New York State Department of Labor, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., May 2, 1974.

13. New York City, Commission on Human Rights, *The Employment of Minorities, Women and the Handicapped in City Government, a Report of a 1970 Survey.*

14. Irving S.K. Chin, commissioner, New York City Commission on Human Rights, "The Asian American" (paper delivered at the New York State Advisory Committee, Public Hearing, New York City, N.Y., June 12, 1974). See Transcript, vol. I, p. 17.

15. The grants have been discontinued as part of the city's austerity program. Sid Frigand, press secretary to Mayor Abe Beame, telephone interview, Sept. 18, 1976.

16. Pub. L. 92-318, Title VII, §§ 702-720, June 23, 1972, 86 Stat. 354-371; 20 U.S.C. 1601-1619.

17. 20 U.S.C. 1619, subsec. (9)(A).

18. U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Subject Report PC(2)-1G.*

19. "Gim-San" is part of the Cantonese dialect spoken in Kwangtung Province from where many immigrants came.

20. Mary Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (New York: Henry Holt, 1909).

21. Transcript, vol. I, p. 90; vol. III, p. 6.

22. Act of Feb. 20, 1907: To regulate the immigration of aliens to the United States 34 Stat. 898; Executive Order No. 589 (Mar. 14, 1907): Entrance of Japanese and Korean labor into the United States.

23. E.K. Strong, *The Second Generation Japanese Problem* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1934), p. 160.

24. 43 Stat. 153; 8 U.S.C. 201.

25. *Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States.*

26. Urban Associates, Inc., *A Study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics* (July 1974) (hereafter cited as Urban Associates Study). Study based on the 1970 census and funded by th. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Urban Associates, Inc., is now known as R.J. Associates, Inc.

27. For a discussion of historical and contemporary issues related to the Pilipino experience, see Royal F. Morales, *Makibaka: The Pilipino American Struggle* (Los Angeles: Mountainview Publishers, 1974).

28. 22 U.S.C. 1394 (1970) (corresponds to the Act of Mar. 24, 1934, ch. 84, 48 Stat. 456).

29. The scouts were soldiers who served under Allied Command in the Bataan Peninsula during World War II. 22 U.S.C. 1251-1395.

30. Act of Apr. 30, 1946. Trade relations between the U.S. and the Philippines, 60 Stat. 141.

31. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, Pub. L. 89-236 §1-6, 8-15, 17-19, 24; 79 Stat. 911-920, 922; 8 U.S.C. §1151-1156.

32. Relatives of citizens and resident aliens eligible for the preference include unmarried adult sons and daughters; spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; married sons and daughters of United States citizens, parents of United States citizens, and resident aliens.

33. U.S., Commission on Civil Rights, *Counting the Forgotten: The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish Speaking Background in the United States* (1974).

34. "During the 5 calendar years, 1970 through 1974, the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service tallied 17,766 legal immigrants from China and Taiwan whose intent was initially to reside in New York City. The same annual reports indicate there were 7,064 such persons from Korea and 9,211 from the Philippines. The 5-year immigration figures show 12,097 persons arriving from India***.From the above figures it may be generalized that the Korean, Pilipino, and Asian Indian population approximately doubled since 1970 and that there was at least a 25 percent increase in the Chinese population." Evelyn S. Mann, director, Population Research, New York City Planning Commission, letter to Eleanor Telemaque, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Northeastern Regional Office, Aug. 6, 1975 (hereafter cited as Mann letter).

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38. Betty Lee Sung, *Chinese American Manpower and Employment* (1975). A report prepared for the Manpower Administration (renamed the Employment and Training Administration in November 1975) of the U.S. Department of Labor under research and development grant no. 21-36-73-13.

39. Mann letter

40. Ibid.

41. Transcript, vol. II, p. 14.

42. Chi-Wing Ho, "Some of the Findings of the National Asian American Field Study to the New York Advisory Committee."

43. Ibid.

44. Urban Associates Study, p. 110.

45. Transcript, vol. II, p. 23.

46. Transcript, vol. I, p. 88.

47. Transcript, vol. I, p. 89.

48. Mann letter, p. 2.

49. Transcript, vol. I, p. 98.

50. George Yuzawa, chairperson, Japanese Americans for the Aging, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., July 10, 1974, and July 18, 1975.

51. Ibid.

52. Tomi Ogata, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., Dec. 20, 1975.

53. Ibid.

54. Urban Associates Study, p. 133.

55. Ibid., p. 132.

56. Transcript, vol. I, p. 144.

57. Ibid., p. 149.

58. Joseph Ryu and Rev. Ty Hsin, staff interviews, New York City, N.Y., July 8, 1974.

59. Tino Calabia, "Footnotes on Elderly Manongs" (speech delivered at the Mid-Atlantic Conference on Community Concerns of Asian Americans, New York City, N.Y., Apr. 26, 1974).

60. Transcript, vol. I, p. 169.

61. Ibid., p. 170.

Chapter 3

Government Policies and the Asian Immigrant

Legacy of the Exclusion Acts

Because of the Oriental Exclusion Acts, many Asians came into and remained in the United States without legal status. These Asians are "illegal aliens." However, their illegal status was caused solely by what are now considered to be discriminatory exclusionary laws. The group most seriously affected was the Chinese. Historian Stamford Lyman noted:

> The limitations placed on the entry of Chinese from 1882 until 1965 were so severe and so disruptive of family relationships that smuggling Chinese can be regarded as an intended consequence of America's immigration policies.[1]

The exclusion acts caused the ingenious invention of the "slot system" by which Chinese sold places in their family tree to other Chinese who could not lawfully bring over members of their own family. The "paper" sons, daughters, and wives entered as relatives of the seller.[2]

No Chinese were allowed into the United States until after World War II, when the tiny quota of 105 persons was established. Thus, many elderly Chinese now in the United States probably came here through the slot system.

Dr. G. Ru-wen Chung, a psychiatrist with the Community Service Society in New York's Chinatown, said, "These old people come with paper names; their parents are usually dead; they have worked hard and paid their taxes, but they live in fear of deportation."[3]

Maurice Kiley, Deputy Director of the New York District Office of the U.S. Immigration and Nationalization Service (INS), estimated that there were more than 1 million illegal aliens in the New York metropolitan area.[4] Most of these aliens, he told Commission staff, were from Spanish-speaking countries; he did not estimate the number of illegal aliens he believed to be Asians.[5]

In 1955 the INS initiated a procedure by which many Chinese who had entered the United States through the "slot system" could attain legal status.[6] However, the program did not give immigrant status to all applicants. Those who did come forward were required to proceed through the naturalization process if they wished to become citizens; the INS would then charge them to the immigrant or nonimmigrant quotas established for Chinese seeking entry to the United States.[7]

Benjamin Gim, treasurer of the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, described some of the problems with the program:

> It's true that the Immigration Service may suspend that person's deportation, may permit him to adjust his status and to legitimize it, but that is discretionary with the Immigration Service to dispense as it wishes.[8]

These old people, Mr. Gim said in an interview with Commission staff, often are not granted permanent residence in the country or the opportunity to adjust their status.[9]

During the Advisory Committee's open meeting, community spokespersons asserted that many immigration lawyers and "consultants" often take unfair advantage of illegal aliens.[10] Many aliens who are ignorant of their rights and eager to stay in the United States are "easy marks for fraud."[11] Thousands are duped every year by professional consultants who obtain clients by guaranteeing results, however, their status is not legalized. If the alien complains or demands a refund, these "consultants" make an anonymous telephone call to the Immigration Service and report the client.[12]

All representatives of the Asian American community requested a policy of leniency towards these aliens. Josephine Ho, a legal services attorney, described the problem of the Chinese alien in obtaining work:

> Illegal aliens***will work because this is the only way they can survive; the differences are that, since they cannot obtain a social security card, they will not pay the taxes which they are otherwise more than willing to pay; and that, since they are driven further underground, they are more susceptible to ex-

> ploitation by employers; those who cannot get a job and cannot get public assistance will somehow manage to survive, perhaps prosper, because crime seems to be the most profitable trade in this country***.[13]

Man She Yen, a social worker in Chinatown, pointed out that many aliens who have been in this country for many years are now elderly and therefore have even more critical problems:

> These elderly Chinese cannot apply for welfare even though they are very often past 70; they are subject to the fact that they have no constitutional rights, no right to counsel, even though they have been in the United States over 50 years***.[14]

"No Knock Raids"

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service has the power to interrogate or arrest without warrant any person believed to be illegally in the United States. Although legislation also give INS investigators the right to board ships under certain conditions, they are not permitted to enter buildings unless they have permission of the owner or a search warrant.[15]

Many Asian spokespersons believe that the INS misuse this authority and conduct what is commonly known as "no knock raids" in Chinatown.[16] David B. Chin, an attorney with Mobilization for Youth Legal Services, Inc., told Commission staff:

> Anyone who has worked in a Chinese restaurant or laundry knows of the harassment that may occur. Immigration agents use the standard of "probable cause" to believe there may be illegal aliens present. They are allowed to raid these places and demand to see proof of legal residence, authorization to work, or citizenship. Often the agent threatens the owner with a close down or with punishment***. Official protests such as the one lodged by the Restaurant Association in Chinatown seem to have little effect on the Service and its conduct.[17]

Edith Lowenstein, former president of the National Association of Immigration and Nationality lawyers, said that many Chinese with legal status are identified with the illegal aliens simply because of the color of their skins and often they are the subjects of these raids. Mrs. Lowenstein said:

> The large number of court decisions which deal with Chinese cases and particularly with arrests without warrant demonstrates that they and the Spanish-speaking aliens, more than other foreign groups, are exposed to certain enforcement activities of questionable constitutionality***.[18]

She criticized the search powers, saying "Indeed, a major source of irritation in these searches is the high-handed, rude, and abusive attitude of the officers making the search."[19]

Maurice Kiley, Deputy Director of the INS New York office, denied that agents abused their authority. Most raids in the New York area, he said, were not made in Chinatown, but he declined to state the number of raids that were conducted in the Chinatown area.[20]

A panel of Asian attorneys told the Advisory Committee that employment of Asians as attorneys in the New York District Office of the INS would help matters. As of November 1976, there were no Asian attorneys so employed.[21]

Visas for Asian Immigrants

The United States consular officers in each country have the right to grant or refuse visas to enter the United States.[22] According to testimony at the informal meeting, Asians found the process of obtaining visas extremely complicated, often humiliating, and frequently unjust.

The U.S. Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 allows American citizens to "petition" or request visas for immediate relatives who are technically classified as "first preference" and who may enter "without any waiting period."[23] However, since most Asians in New York City are permanent residents rather than citizens, their spouses and children (who are classified as "second preference") are not granted immediate entry. Brothers and sisters of permanent residents are accorded no preference whatsoever.

Consular officers have the authority to rule on the validity of the relationship between a visa applicant and his or her relative in the United States. Attorney Benjamin Gim, treasurer of the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, said, "Where spouses wish to join husbands in the United States, the consular officer overseas determines whether a marriage may or may not have been consummated or whether the intent of the marriage was to "defraud" the United States Government."[24]

In an interview with Commission staff, Jeanette Ming, an Asian American school teacher, criticized the authority of the consular officers. She described the problem encountered when her husband in Taiwan applied for a visa:

> First, he was told that there were questions concerning his birth certificate, then our marriage. Then when these were finally taken care of, he was told that they had to find our whether he has the "capability" for subversion. How can a consular officer overseas, unfamiliar with the Asian culture or family ties, determine beyond a doubt that a person has this capability. I believe that unbridled power to consular officers causes abuse.[25]

According to several Asian spokespersons, many of the problems encountered by Asians seeking visas were intensified because of the attitude of the visa officers. These officers, they said, were often rude and unduly suspicious, and assumed that all Asians wished to commit "fraud."[26]

Norman Lau Kee, a member of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, criticized the U.S. Consulate Office in Hong Kong for requesting future employers of Chinese visa applicants to submit income tax returns to them. He said:

> I have had cases where a sister applying for a brother had a house worth $65,000 free and clear of all mortgages, $27,000 cash in the bank among other things, an employment offer for him, and they still turned him down and said he had to send in the tax return of the prospective employer***.I would doubt that any employer would want to submit his income tax return to the visa officer in Hong Kong to show that he is ready to give (a person) a job.[27]

Cornelius Scully, Chief of the Regulations and Legislation Division of the Visa Office of the U.S. Department of State in Washington, D.C., testified that, in certain cases, the visa office can request an income tax return from the prospective employer of a visa applicant to determine if the job is real or "an accomodation job" and to determine if it is a "real employer."[28] An employer has an "obligation to act in good faith," Mr. Scully said.[29]

The consular officer makes the final determination on visas. An applicant may request, but is not assured, the right of review. "You can request a review, but it is not always honored," said Norman Kee. In my experience "it is more often denied than granted."[30]

A panel of Asian American attorneys recommended that the right of review be made absolute for all visa cases.[31]

Josephine Ho, director of the Asian American Legal Defense Fund, Inc., testified that, in contrast to the U.S. system, Canada has a liberal immigration process with a guaranteed review system:

> Any applicant whose application has been refused may request that the application be reviewed. The applicant will, at the very least, be given a complete explanation as to why the application has been refused. If the application is reviewed, it will be seen by several persons rather than being seen only by the official who originally refused [to grant the application]. After some discussion, it was clear that most applicants seeking review will be granted such a review. Any application which lies dormant after refusal for a year will expire and the applicant must reapply.[32]

Eligibility of Immigrants for Social Security and Welfare

Because of the tremendous influx of Asians since 1965, Asians who have come into this country legally also have many problems. One particular problem that received attention from the Advisory Committee was the difficulty faced by immigrants in obtaining social security, old age assistance, and welfare benefits.

First, Asians in this country have difficulty in clarifying their status and obtaining the necessary identification to be eligible for Federal and State programs. Josephine Ho, a legal services attorney, said: "Birth certificates are not a known commodity in many sections of Asia. Many native born American citizens do not have birth certificates, yet often applicants are told to write to China to get their birth certificates."[33]

Ray Alcarez, an Asian American staff member of the Social Security Administration center nearest to Chinatown, told Commission staff that identification in the form of a green card, which establishes legal residency for aliens, or a passport is "not acceptable as proof of age." Pilipino applicants for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), he said, were often requested to produce a tax record (known as a "cedula") from the province in which they were born as additional proof of age. Other Asians, he added, are often asked to present affidavits from witnesses "still living" to indicate the age of a prospective SSI applicant."[34]

Because of the identification problem, many Asians who have come into this country legally are treated as if they were aliens. Ms. Ho said:

> Identification of aliens is difficult. Many employers, who do not have a keen interest in hiring minority groups to begin with, are refusing to hire anyone who looks like an alien.[35]

Second, since the Social Security law is complex, some regulations have been interpreted in such a way that Asians may be left out of programs for which they could be considered eligible.[36] According to Joseph P. Kelly, New York Regional Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Supplemental Security Income is available for eligible elderly persons who are American citizens or who are lawful aliens residing in the United States "under color of the law."[37] But, according to David Chin, attorney for Mobilization of Youth Legal Services, the term "under color of law" has never been adequately defined in the American courts. "The problem was and still is what 'color of law' means is still a phrase uninterpreted by the courts," he said.[38]

Frank F. Alloca, information officer for the New York State Department of Social Services, stated that Federal and State statutes regarding assistance to immigrants is in the "gray area since immigrants are expected to prove that they have a legal right to be in New York City." Mr. Alloca said:

> In certain types of situations, i.e. fugitives, we would have to report their presence to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In the instances of persons holding visitors' visas, we would get in touch with the signer of his/her affidavit of support here. We need verification for reimbursement in our budget from Federal and State authorities.[39]

Third, information on these programs is not always translated into Chinese and other Asian languages, and bilingual staff are rarely employed in the field offices. According to one member of the Asian American Field Study:

> SSA (the Social Security Administration) translates informational materials, but not forms; no translation is provided by SSA to consumers who have need to know of benefits in the area of medical insurance—an item of particular importance to elderly Chinese.[40]

The Asian American Field Study staff also charged that there are not enough Asians employed by Social Security Administration and that services in general are inadequate.[41]

In a statement before the Advisory Committee, Joseph Kelly, Regional Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, said that his office was attempting to increase and improve its services to the Asian community:

> Presently***every district office is being asked to report all non-English speaking language needs. When their reports are received, we will determine whether additional bilingual services are needed and how best to furnish them***. In addition, our Bureau of District Office Operations is preparing a comprehensive analysis of Asian American needs and services with specific affirmative action recommendations for various SSA components.[42]

Following the Advisory Committee's informal hearing, specific action was taken by SSA, including the opening of an office near Chinatown.

According to Jane Lim, director of the new Social Security Administration office near Chinatown, many more Asians are seeking SSI because of a public information "saturation" campaign started in 1975.[43] Irving Chin, commissioner of the New York City Commission on Human Rights, said, "The main difficulty encountered by Asians when applying for welfare was the lack of bilingual staff to assist them. In many cases, the language barrier often discourages people from even trying to apply."[44]

Finally, according to other testimony, staff in the field offices are often unfriendly and discourage Asians from applying for welfare benefits. Josephine Ho alleged that "welfare agencies***are harassing those who speak with a foreign accent."[45]

In a memorandum to all welfare centers, James Dumpson, the department's commissioner at that time, wrote that there should be "no difference in treatment of permanent residents as long as they were equally otherwise qualified."[46] No information was collected on the effect of this new policy statement on the treatment of Asian applicants in the field offices. As indicated in the Urban Associates Study and the Asian American Field Study, relatively few Asians receive welfare, social security, old age assistance, or other benefits. The

Asian American Field Study also indicated that all Asians eligible for welfare payments are not receiving them. Only 1.8 percent of Chinatown residents, it found, were welfare clients although 68.8 percent of families surveyed lived below the Federal poverty level.

A statement submitted at the informal hearing by Chi-Wing Ho, a member of the Asian American Field Study, noted that Chinese and Asians are underrepresented among persons receiving income maintenance:

> The two income maintenance unit centers surveyed did not have the full percentage data of Asian recipients to the total number of recipients. One of these centers stated that there were only 5 or 6 [Chinese] beneficiaries (despite the fact that the center was close to Chinatown). The other center surveyed stated that out of a total of 6,717 beneficiaries in December 1973, only 47 recipients of income maintenance were Asians.[47]

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Stamford M. Lyman, *Chinese Americans* (New York: Random House, 1974), pp. 105–12.

2. Ibid., p. 110. The system used the "fact that American citizens of Chinese descent and members of the exempt classes (merchants, traders, teachers) could lawfully bring wives and children into America."

3. Dr. G. Ru-wen Chung, staff interview, New York City, N. Y., Jan. 25, 1976.

4. New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Transcript of Public Hearing, June 12–14, 1974, New York City, N.Y., vol. III, p. 96 (hereafter cited as Transcript).

5. Ibid.

6. For a lengthy discussion of the historical background of this program, see: U.S., Immigration and Naturalization Service, "Background Interpretor Release," no. 2, vol. 37, Jan. 15, 1960, and INS annual reports, 1959, 1960, and 1961; See also U.S., Department of Justice, press release, Dec. 27, 1959; and U.S., Congress, S. Rept. 2276(Oct. 4, 1976).

7. Benjamin Gim, staff interview, New York City, N. Y. Dec. 11, 1975 (hereafter cited as Gim Interview).

8. Transcript, vol. III, p. 14.

9. Gim Interview.

10. Transcript, vol. III, p. 109.

11. Ibid.

12. David B. Chin, attorney, Mobilization for Youth Legal Services, staff interview, Washington, D.C., Jan. 10, 1975 (hereafter cited as David Chin Interview).

13. Transcript, vol. III, p. 114.

14. Man She Yen (speech delivered at the Mid-Atlantic Conference on Community Concerns of Asian Americans, New York City, N. Y., Apr. 26, 1974).

15. 8 U.S.C. §§1357, entitled "Powers of Immigration Officers and Employees—Powers Without Warrants."

16. Norman Lau Kee, Benjamin Gim, and Irving Chin, staff interviews, New York City, N. Y., July 8, 1974.

17. David Chin Interview.

18. Transcript, vol. III, p. 35.

19. Edith Lowenstein, telephone interview, July 10, 1974.

20. Transcript, vol. III, p. 84.

21. J.D. Howerton, New York Deputy District Director, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, telephone interview, May 28, 1975.

22. 8 U.S.C. §§1201, entitled "Issuance of Visas: Immigrants, Non Immigrants."

23. Pub. L. 89-236 §§1–6, 8–15, 17–19, 24; 79 Stat. 911–20, 922; 8 U.S.C. §§1154.

24. Gim Interview.

25. Jeanette Ming, staff interview, New York City, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1976.

26. Transcript, vol. III, pp. 20–21.

27. Ibid., p. 22.

28. Ibid., p. 88.

29. Ibid., p. 78.

30. Ibid., p. 25.

31. Norman Lau Kee, Benjamin Gim, Josephine Ho, Irving Chin, telephone interviews, Jan. 4, 10, and 12, 1975.

32. Josephone Ho, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., May 10, 1974.

33. Ibid.

34. Ray Alcaraz, telephone interview, Sept. 18, 1975.

35. Transcript, vol. III, pp. 112–13.

36. 42 U.S.C. §401 *et seq.* (Supp. 1974).

37. Joseph Kelly, New York Regional Commissioner, Social Security Administration, statement submitted to the New York State Advisory Committee public hearing, July 13, 1974, (hereafter cited as Kelly Statement). Available in NERO files.

38. David Chin Interview.

39. Frank Alloca, New York State Department of Social Services, telephone interview, June 22, 1975.

40. Chi-Wing Ho, "Some of the Findings of the National Asian American Field Study to the New York Advisory Committee" (hereafter cited as Ho Exhibit).

41. According to the Social Security Administration, the booklet "Your Medicare Handbook" is printed in Chinese. Joseph Kelly, Regional Commissioner, letter to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Nov. 26, 1976.

42. Kelly Statement.

43. Jane Lim, director, Chinatown office, Social Security Administration, telephone interview, Mar. 20, 1976.

44. Irving Chin, staff interview, New York City, N. Y. Mar. 2, 1976.

45. Transcript, vol. III, p. 113.

46. Ron Smollen, special assistant to James Dumpson, commissioner, New York City Department of Social Services, telephone interview, June 4, 1974.

47. Ho Exhibit.

Chapter 4

Employment

In its study, the Advisory Committee looked at both the degree to which Asian Americans were overrepresented in the traditional industries—restaurants, laundries, and garment factories—and the difficulties faced by those seeking training and employment in other industries.

The Advisory Committee reviewed the employment of Asians in New York City and New York State governments and in the construction industry. The Advisory Committee looked in greater detail at the city's Health and Hospitals Corporation and problems faced by Asian pharmacists seeking professional positions. No attempt was made to review Asian employment in Federal agencies or private corporations.

The Asian Work Force

New York City has a total population of about 7,894,000, of whom approximately 2.9 percent are Asian.[1] The city has a total civilian work force of approximately 3,330,800. Although there are no precise census statistics on the Asian work force, the New York City Planning Commission estimates that the Chinese make up 0.9 percent of the work force; Japanese, 0.2 percent; Pilipinos, 0.2 percent; and other Asian groups and American Indians, 0.4 percent. The nonwhite work force excluding blacks and Puerto Ricans is 1.8 percent (See exhibit M). The Advisory Committee believes that, because of the census undercount of Asians and increased immigration since 1970, the number of Asians in the work force is higher than that estimated by the planning commission.

Asians are relatively well represented in the managerial, operative, and service worker categories which include the health field, restaurants, laundries, and the garment industry (see exhibit L). They are underrepresented to the greatest degree in the craftsman category. As indicated in exhibit M, there are proportionately more Asians in the labor force than members of other groups in comparison to their representation in the population.

Although there are no comprehensive data on the specific areas of work and the salaries of the individual Asian groups, the Urban Associates study shows that individual Asian groups are concentrated in a few job areas or industries. Exhibit G shows that a large majority of the Chinese are working as laborers, service workers, and operatives and confirms that the Chinese tend to remain in the traditional sources of employment—restaurants, laundries, and garment factories. Betty Lee Sung's study confirmed this pattern: 43.7 percent of the Chinese female work force are employed as operatives, probably in the garment industry operating sewing machines, and 36 percent of Chinese men are service workers, probably in restaurants (see exhibit H).[2]

Exhibit G also shows that a relatively large number of Pilipino and Japanese men—41.9 and 30.4 percent, respectively—are in the professional category (primarily in the health fields) and a relatively large number of Japanese men—12.8 percent—are managers and administrators.

The Urban Associates Study also documented the underemployment of Asian groups. The study indicates that a significantly small number of Asians with college degrees are earning $10,000 or more.[3] The Asian American Field Study shows that of 19 Chinese surveyed who had college degrees, 8 were working as laborers.[4]

Traditional Industries

Until the end of World War II, because of discriminatory employment patterns, most Asians did not seek work in the general labor market. Instead, they went into areas of business unregulated by State or Federal Government. Many owned small businesses themselves, and many specialized in services which the white community regarded as menial. Some established restaurants in Chinatowns, in "Little Manilas," and in "Little Tokyos." Others opened laundries or went to work in sewing factories where inadequate English was not a barrier. To this day, this pattern has per-

EXHIBIT G
Employment of Asian Groups by Occupation in Selected Urban Areas

		Japanese (urban areas outside Calif. & Hawaii)	Chinese (New York City)	Pilipinos (selected urban areas)
Labor force	Male	76.3	70.9	83.1
	Female	40.4	50.5	61.0
Professional & tech. workers	Male	30.4	16.9	41.9
	Female	16.7	12.6	54.5
Managers & administrators	Male	12.8	9.5	3.1
	Female	3.8	3.4	1.4
Salesworkers	Male	6.2	4.5	1.9
	Female	5.7	3.4	2.0
Clerical workers	Male	8.3	8.5	10.1
	Female	28.5	24.8	21.7
Crafts & kindred workers	Male	13.1	4.5	8.3
	Female	2.2	1.5	0.8
Operatives	Male	10.1	16.1	10.6
	Female	18.4	46.2	7.0
Laborers, except farm	Male	5.3	1.8	4.6
	Female	0.8	0.8	0.4
Farm managers & laborers	Male	6.1	0.1	2.4
	Female	2.5	0.0	0.5
Service workers	Male	7.8	38.1	16.9
	Female	22.4	7.2	11.6

Source: Urban Associates data derived from: U.S, Bureau of the Census, *1970 Census of Population Detailed Characteristics, PC(1)–D1, United States Summary, and Subject Reports: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States,* PC(2)–1G.

EXHIBIT H
Occupational Classification of the Chinese in New York City, 1970

Males employed 16 years and older	**Percent**
Professional, technical	18.6
Managers	10.3
Salesworkers	4.5
Clerical workers	8.3
Craftpersons	4.3
Operatives	15.7
Laborers, except farm	1.7
Farmers, mgrs., & laborers	0.1
Service workers	36.0
Private household workers	0.5
Females employed 16 years and older	
Professional, technical	14.0
Managers	3.6
Salesworkers	3.4
Clerical workers	25.4
Craftpersons	1.4
Operatives	43.7
Laborers, except farm	0.7
Farmers, mgrs., & laborers	0.0
Service workers	5.6
Private household workers	2.1

Source: Compiled by Betty Lee Sung and presented to the Advisory Committee at the informal public hearing.

sisted. Asians still are concentrated in three areas: restaurants, laundries, and garment factories.

The concentration of Asians in these three areas is of concern for several reasons. First, this concentration implies that other areas are not open to Asians and that equality of employment opportunity does not to exist for them in other job markets. Second, but of equal concern, all three traditional areas of employment are declining rather than growing and no longer offer the same opportunities for employment. According to testimony before the Advisory Committee, Asians are "locked" into these areas which offer fewer and fewer opportunities and they face serious obstacles in entering new areas of work.

The Restaurant Industry

New York City has several hundred Asian restaurants. In Chinatown alone there are approximately 120 restaurants. The highest paying position in a restaurant is that of cook, a position for which extensive training is required. Because of long and irregular working hours, it often is difficult for restaurant employees to study English or participate in job training programs. Therefore, most Chinese are in the lower paying jobs such as busboy or kitchen helper.

By tradition, the Asian busboy or kitchen helper hoped to save enough money from his wages to buy shares with other dishwashers and helpers in order to start their own business. Today, however, the cost of owning a restaurant has risen. Food prices have increased rapidly and employment opportunities are declining, with many restaurants opening and closing in rapid succession. Further, Asians no longer have a monopoly of ownership. Some restaurants which specialize in Chinese foods are owned by whites.

Robert S. Tsang, secretary of the Chinese Restaurant Association, summarized the situation at the Advisory Committee's informal hearing:

> The Chinese restaurant industry is near its saturation point***.Due to the high costs of food, high rentals, and high capitalization, the profit margin is much lower***. The total of these food costs averages about 80 percent increase and yet on the average, restaurants have raised their prices only about 35–40 percent in the past year and a half. With higher food costs, increased numbers of Chinese restaurants, lesser profits, and more importantly, less people dining out, the outlook for the Chinese restaurant industry is not healthy. Unemployment in the Chinese restaurant industry will increase. New immigrants will find jobs more difficult to obtain. The industry has been a large source of employment for the Chinese and new immigrants with few skills and little proficiency in English.[5]

Laundries

At one time, the Chinese hand laundry crisscrossed the country. Almost every Chinese child knew an aunt or uncle who operated a Chinese laundry. The tub vats were in the backroom and the shirts were ironed by hand. In these days, only a few thousand dollars were needed to start a laundry business. Chinese operators of steam laundries encountered discriminatory practices such as requirements for expensive fees or the restrictions of the old "pole ordinances."[6] Nonetheless, Chinese laundries prospered in many areas.

Today, the old Chinese laundry is a thing of the past. Because of competition from permanent press sheets and clothing, from the "coin-operated laundry" around the corner, and from larger mechanized operations, the number of Chinese hand laundries has decreased significantly in recent years. According to Jin F. Moy, president of the Chinese Laundry Association, the number of Chinese laundries in New York State has declined from 3,000 to 1,000.[7]

Lacking the capital for large enterprises, many Chinese laundries now send their wash out to other laundries specializing in washing and ironing. Most laundries are little more than collection and distribution stations for walk-in customers.

Mr. Moy requested a government study of the problems facing hand laundries in New York and requested government funding for a training program to upgrade the family business to dry cleaning.[8]

The Garment Industry

There are more than 1,000 garment firms in New York which produce sportswear, skirts, blouses, and neckwear. Of these, approximately 260 are located in Chinatown where Chinese operate the sewing machines and act as "middlemen" or small entrepeneurs. Much of the sportswear manufactured in New York City is handled by these small entrepreneurs.[9]

EXHIBIT I
Asian Clients in New York City, CETA and Other Employment Programs, Fiscal Year 1975

Program	Total clients	Asian clients	Percent Asians
CETA			
Public employment jobs	20,000	272	1.4%
Work experience jobs	7,206	8	0.1
Job training in classrooms	5,566	193	3.5
Classroom training*	5,157	125	2.4
On-the-job training	3,086	6	0.2
Services to clients	7,365	20	0.2
State and local programs			
Participants regional manpower systems	122,293	1,072	0.9
Job Placement	28,244	340	1.2

* In contrast to job training in classrooms that trains participants for specific jobs, classroom training provides skill-oriented or academic training.

Source: Lucille Rose, Commissioner, New York City Department of Employment statement submitted to NERO Staff, Aug. 21, 1975.

EXHIBIT J
New York State Government Employees by Race, Ethnicity, and Job Category, 1974

	White	Black	Spanish Speaking	Asian	Other	Total
Administrators and professionals	48,502	3,588	709	761	557	54,117
Percent	89.6	6.6	1.3	1.4	1.0	
Technicians	5,957	600	78	12	37	6,694
Percent	89.0	9.1	1.2	0.1	0.6	
Investigators, business management, data processors	4,789	171	44	9	11	5,024
Percent	95.3	3.4	0.9	0.2	0.2	
Clericals	29,772	3,898	649	42	49	34,410
Percent	86.5	11.3	1.9	0.1	0.1	
Craftpersons	7,052	368	128	8	13	7,569
Percent	93.2	4.9	1.7	0.1	0.2	
Operatives	5,922	618	264	5	23	6,832
Percent	86.7	9.0	3.9	0.1	0.3	
Protective services	10,046	1,630	347	3	20	12,046
Percent	83.3	13.5	2.9	—	0.2	
Service workers	26,625	14,050	1,951	122	207	42,955
Percent	62.0	32.7	4.5	0.3	0.5	
Laborers	8,954	432	94	40	38	9,521
Percent	94.0	4.5	1.0	—	0.4	
Total no.	147,619	25,365	4,264	963	957	179,168

Source: New York State Eighth Annual Census.

Statistics provided by the New York State Employment Service and local 23–25 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), AFL-CIO, show that the first Chinese workers joined the garment unions about 20 years ago. Fifteen years ago, local 23–25 had 500 Chinese members. Today, the local has more than 6,000 Asian members (mostly Chinese) out of a total membership of 19,000.[10]

For these workers, ILGWU conducts job placement services, counselling services, and English language classes. Staff of ILGWU estimate that more than 1,000 Chinese members have attended its English classes.[11]

Shelley Appleton, vice president of ILGWU, said that many garment industries are leaving New York City. Because of the rising cost of labor, the need for more capital, and competition from larger nationwide clothing companies, many small "shops" owned by the Chinese are closing.[12]

Edward Leong, president of the Chinese Garment Workers Association, described how financial difficulties have forced many Chinese shops to close or reduce their work forces. His own shop, which 7 years ago had about 70 people, now employs 45.[13]

Mr. Leong noted that it is very costly to train a new immigrant in the garment industry because trainees must be paid union wages. ILGWU does not have apprenticeship training programs in Chinatown, and he suggested that the Federal Government should provide training for Asian immigrants.[14]

Employment Services for Asian Workers

For a large number of Asians, the alternative to menial labor or employment in restaurants, laundries, and garment factories is training for and placement in new fields of endeavor. Community testimony centered on the lack of available training for other than the traditional areas.

New York State Employment Service (NYSES)

The New York State Employment Service is responsible for the administration of unemployment and referral programs. Asians are not represented as clients in the employment referral program to the degree they are represented in the work force (1.8 percent). According to information presented at the informal public hearing, during fiscal year 1975 Asians comprised 0.9 percent of all persons placed in jobs by NYSES.[15]

Saul Volin, acting director for the New York State unemployment insurance, told Commission staff that a significant percentage of Asians receive unemployment insurance. About 257 persons (or 7.3 percent) of 3,550 clients of two offices near Chinatown, he said, were Chinese. Many of those receiving insurance are Chinese women in the garment industry who are union members.[16]

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)

CETA establishes a flexible, decentralized system of Federal, State, and local employment and training activities.[17] Its purpose is "to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities."[18]

In New York City CETA monies are administered by the department of employment. A total of $543,256 of CETA funds for Asian projects came to New York City in fiscal year 1975. The money, allocated to four training projects in Chinatown, made up 0.8 percent of the total CETA funding for the city.[19]

In all CETA-funded programs, except for on-the-job and classroom training, Asian participation was below Asian representation for the total New York City labor force (see exhibit I).

Some Asian groups criticized the manpower projects earmarked for Asians because the projects were located in Chinatown and were inaccessible to or failed to meet the needs of other Asian communities.[20]

In addition, Asians are underrepresented in other publicly funded training programs. Only 0.9 percent of the participants in New York City's 12 regional manpower training systems are Asian. These programs train people for a variety of jobs including clerical, secretarial, repair, and other semiskilled positions.

Many Chinese alleged that the type of training received was too little and too late. Paul Chin, a former director of the Chinatown manpower project, said, "There were always many more job ap-

plicants than jobs available." Because the Chinatown manpower project initially concentrated on training Chinese for banks, the program had difficulty during the recent economic recession when openings in banks were limited. "There are very few OJT slots available to the Asian community in general," Mr. Chin said.[21]

New Areas of Employment

The Building and Construction Trades

Like blacks and Puerto Ricans before them, Asians have begun looking to the building and construction industry for employment—and, more specifically, for admission to the trade unions which control jobs on major construction sites in New York City.

In 1974, according to the EEOC, there were 22 Asian Americans (0.3 percent) among the 6,929 apprentices in programs operated by the joint labor-management apprenticeship committies in the New York SMSA. There were 113 (or 0.1 percent) Asians out of 88,726 "referral union members."[22]

Since then, in contrast to some efforts for other minority groups, few steps have been taken to bring Asians into the construction industry. At the public hearing, Asians charged that they were still seriously underrepresented.[23]

There are several reasons for the continuing underrepresentation. First, under existing Federal, State, and city regulations covering affirmative action plans, Asians are not recognized as a separate minority group. James McNamara, then acting director of New York City's Office of Contract Compliance, said:

> The situation in terms of Orientals in the construction industry is about what it was for blacks and Puerto Ricans many years ago. Orientals simply have not been recognized by the government agencies, by the unions or the contractors as a group that is considered minorities and a group that is considered disadvantaged.[24]

At the informal public hearing, Mr. McNamara said that Federal, State, and city compliance programs did not specify "divisions within a minority."[25] In an interview with Commission staff he said that the aggregates of black, Puerto Rican, and other minority workers technically satisfied the "minority requirement" of specific contracts.[26]

However, Louis Blumengarten of the Federal Office of Contract Compliance Programs told the Advisory Committee that his office "expects" but does not require that a group or subgroup get its "share of the action." Further, he said, the office relied upon minority community representatives and employees of hometown plans to operate the outreach section to bring in minority people.[27]

City executive orders do not require goals for specific subgroups within the category "minority." Further, city officials said, they do not recruit specific numbers of different minority groups.[28]

Leila Long, director of the office for equal opportunity for the New York City Housing and Development Administration, said:

> My authority is limited by the various executive orders under which I function. These orders in and of themselves do not set specific timetables or goals for specific minorities within the minority community***.Until I am given regulations or guidelines or timetables which deal specifically with Asian Americans***or other minority groups, it is impossible for me to arbitrarily set either goals or timetables***.[29]

The failure of Federal, State, and local authorities to recognize Asians in their definition of minorities has been upheld in court. The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, in cases involving local 638 of the Steamfitters Union and local 28 of the Sheetmetal Workers Union, ruled that the court did not recognize Asians as a minority group with respect to unions which had to meet court-ordered goals.[30]

A second factor for the continuing underrepresentation of Asians in the construction industry is the lack of training available in the Chinatown area. According to Ernest Green, then executive director of Recruitment and Training Program (RTP) of the Workers Defense League,[31] RTP proposed to the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) that a training office be opened in Chinatown in 1971.[32] No such office has yet been approved by DOL.

Confucius Plaza

The issue of Asian employment in the building and construction industry erupted in a direct confrontation involving the Asian community, the contractors, and the police at Confucius Plaza, the first major construction project to be built in the Chinatown area in nearly a decade. Confucius

Plaza, located at Division Street and the Bowery in Chinatown, is a cooperative apartment complex including a school and commercial space. It was sponsored by the Chinese Chamber of Commerce.

A series of incidents occurred in May 1974 as a result of charges by the community that Asians were not being employed on the site. Backed by black and Puerto Rican groups in the city, Asians picketed the site for several days, during which time 57 Asians were arrested and charged with criminal trespass. It was one of the few times that New York City had witnessed direct action by Asians for their own benefit.[33]

After the confrontations with the police, Asian Americans for Equal Employment (AAFEE) requested the assistance of the Northeastern Regional Office (NERO) of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Commission staff arranged meetings for the AAFEE, the Board of Urban Affairs (BUA) (representing unions and contractors), New York City Housing Development Administration (HDA), and the Community Relations Service (CRS) of the U.S. Department of Justice. Other parties who became involved in the negotiations were the president of the New York City Council, staff of U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits, then New York City Human Rights Commissioner Irving Chin, and the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution.[34]

On June 27, an agreement was signed establishing a goal of 12 Asian journeymen to be employed on sites throughout the city. In addition, AAFEE, the sponsors, and HDA established a goal of 12 to 13 Asian American trainees to be hired from lists to be provided by AAFEE. This agreement was the first in which a government compliance agency established goals specifically for Asian Americans.[35]

In response to the pressure from the Asian community, the city, the press, and other factors, Asians were hired for the Confucius Plaza project. In July 1974, Alfonse L. DeMatteis, president of Leon D. DeMatteis, Inc., in a letter to the New York State Advisory Committee, reported that 20 Asians (11.3 percent of the total work force) were employed at the site.[36]

State Government

According to the New York State Civil Service Commission, in 1974 of 179,168 State government employees, 963 or 0.5 percent were Asian. There are no precise statistics on Asians in the labor force statewide. Since many State agencies are located in metropolitan areas with higher concentrations of Asians, Asians should be represented in the State government work force according to their representation in the larger metropolitan areas. The Advisory Committee assumes that the appropriate representation for Asians in State agencies lies between the 1.2 percent Asian representation in the State population and the 1.8 percent representation in the New York City labor force (see exhibits B and M).[37]

Asians are underrepresented in all but the highest paying positions. They hold 241 or 5.7 percent of the 4,255 jobs in the highest salary grades. They hold less than 1 percent of the jobs in all the other grade categories. In all categories except for the administrators and professionals. Asians are less than 0.5 percent. In that category, there are 761 Asians or 1.4 percent of the total (see exhibit J). The majority of Asians are concentrated in three State departments: mental hygiene (629), the State University of New York (117), and health (63). Asians are less than 0.5 percent of the following State departments: correctional services, education, evironmental conservation, general services, parks and recreation, State police, labor, the State University, and transportation.[38] With the exception of the division of human rights, data only on those agencies hiring more than 1,000 persons are presented in exhibit K.

New York City Government

In New York City government, data on Asian employees are collected only for the Chinese. Other Asians are grouped with American Indians, Pakistani, and Asian Indians in a category called "other minority."

According to the most recent data available, New York City had approximately 350,000 employees in 1971. In a New York City Commission on Human Rights survey, about 817 or 0.3 percent of 274,758 employees were Chinese and 2,184 or 0.8 percent were members of "other minority groups" (including non-Chinese Asians) (see exhibit N).

Brooke Aronson Trent, then research director of the New York City commission, said, "Because 'other minority' refers to a number of ethnic

EXHIBIT K
Asian Americans in Selected State Agencies, 1974

	All groups	Asians	Percent Asians
State Division of Human Rights	215	0	0.0 %
State Insurance Fund	1,388	7	0.5
State Police	3,945	2	0.05
Transportation	14,235	6	0.42
Health	4,540	63	1.38
General Services	3,041	1	0.03
Labor	9,248	15	0.16
Law	1,011	0	0.0
Mental Hygiene	61,010	629	1.03
Motor Vehicles	2,962	4	0.13
Social Services	2,304	10	0.43
Taxation, Finance	5,518	15	0.27
Thruway Authority	2,738	0	0.0
State University of N.Y.	26,482	117	0.42
Workmen's Compensation Board	1,542	2	0.12
Correctional Services	9,253	18	0.01
Education	3,754	14	0.37
Environmental Conservation	3,344	9	0.02
Parks & Recreation	3,764	3	0.07

Source: New York State Annual Ethnic Survey.

EXHIBIT L
New York City Labor Force Occupational Classification by Race and Ethnicity, 1970

	Total	White	Black	Puerto Rican	Asian	Percent Asian
Professional, managerial, and technician	753,353	659,323	77,069	17,315	16,961	2.2%
Sales	232,848	210,158	20,025	10,299	2,665	1.1
Clerical	863,671	695,669	157,014	43,937	10,988	1.2
Craftpersons	325,988	270,436	52,657	24,150	2,895	0.9
Operatives	477,162	352,842	112,196	69,560	12,124	2.5
Laborers	106,916	77,786	27,936	9,508	1,194	1.1
Service workers	431,432	278,261	141,161	39,534	12,010	2.8

Source: 1970 census data filed with the New York State Advisory Committee by the New York City Planning Commission (July 1975).

EXHIBIT M
New York City Labor Force by Race, Ethnicity, and Sex, 1970

Group	Percent of labor force	Percent male in labor force	Percent female in labor force
White	79.5	75.0	49.0
Black	18.6	73.0	46.0
Puerto Rican*	6.9	72.0	28.0
Other nonwhite	1.8		
Chinese	0.9	70.9	50.5
Japanese**	0.2	76.3	40.4
Pilipino**	0.2	83.1	61.0
Other***	0.4	75.0	43.0

* Also counted in the black and white categories; therefore, the percentages do not add up to 100 percent.

** These figures taken from the Urban Associates Study are for all Japanese in the United States outside of Hawaii and California and for all Pilipinos in the United States in urban areas outside of Hawaii and California.

*** Includes American Indians, Asian Indians, Hawaiians, Koreans, etc.

Source: New York City Planning Commission and Urban Associates Study.

groups, the Asian representation other than Chinese is probably well below the 0.8 percent level, and probably well below the 1.1 percent represented in the total city government work force."[39]

As noted earlier, the Chinese make up 0.9 percent of the city's population and 0.9 percent of the city's labor force. Other nonwhite minorities (excluding blacks and Puerto Ricans) make up 1.4 percent of the population and 0.9 percent of the labor force. Exhibit O shows that when compared with the total city labor force, the Asian representation in city government is less than 0.5 percent in all the job categories listed.

Asian city workers make up more than 1 percent in only one job category—professionals—and within that category only at the lowest job levels.

The Asian community was particularly concerned about the low representation in the operative, crafts, service, and clerical categories. Those areas have jobs in which Asians without professional skills could be employed outside of the traditional industries.

Chinese and other minority groups are underrepresented in almost all departments and agencies. Because of the large number of city departments, data on only the larger agencies are provided in exhibit P. Chinese representation is less than 1 percent in the 18 largest departments in city government. Only three departments, the health and hospitals corporation, the health department, and the municipal services administration employ more than 1 percent of "other" minority groups, which include American Indians and central and Far Eastern Asians other than Chinese. Persons presenting information to the Advisory Committee said they believed that a large number of these "other minority" employees were Indians and Pakistanis working in the health fields.[40]

In 1971 there were no Chinese or other Asians among the 14,873 persons in the fire department. There were only 7 Chinese and 10 persons in the "other minority" category (excluding blacks and Puerto Ricans) among the 35,310 persons in the police department.[41]

Although the city has not made available more recent data on the employment patterns in the government, the human rights commission has completed an analysis of those persons laid off between July 1974 and November 1975. A total of 46,435 workers (or 28.2 percent) of the 164,894 employees in agencies under the mayor's direct control lost their jobs. Although minority workers in general were disproportionately affected by cutbacks, the category that included Asian Americans and American Indians was reduced by 30 percent by layoffs. This was only slightly higher than the general cutback. No statistics on layoffs were made available on the agencies outside the mayor's direct control, such as the board of education, which has significant Asian representation.[42]

The health and hospitals corporation was of particular interest to persons presenting information to the Advisory Committee for several reasons. First, this city agency employs a relatively high percentage of Asians—1,352 (or 3 percent) of 45,000 persons in 1974.[43] Second, there are a large number of Asian-born and-trained physicians, surgeons, nurses, and hospital workers who immigrated to the United States under the occupational preference provisions of the immigration act.

Several persons testifying before the Advisory Committee said that they believed Asians were underrepresented in the highest management positions in city hospitals.[44]

Asians are well represented in the professional category, where they hold 9.2 percent of the jobs. They are slightly underrepresented in the official and administrator category where they hold 1.4 percent of the jobs. They were underrepresented in the lower paying clerical and service areas.

According to a January 1977 letter from John L.S. Holloman, Jr., then president of the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, Asian Americans have made major gains in the corporation in the last 2 years and have been the least adversely affected by city layoffs (see exhibit R and appendix).[45] In 1974 it was estimated that of 6,000 nurses employed by New York City hospitals, 855 or 14.3 percent were from the Philippines.[46] The relatively high representation of Asians in the health and hospital corporation is in part because of active recruitment by the city. According to Barbara Johnson, director of professional recruitment for the agency, the city recruited nurses in the Philippines to fill needed staff positions at the 18 city hospitals.[47]

Two Asians criticized the "hostile environment"

EXHIBIT N
New York City Government Employees by Race and Ethnicity, 1971

GROUP	NO. EMPLOYED IN N.Y. CITY GOVERNMENT*	PERCENT	REPRESENTATION IN THE CITY'S LABOR FORCE
White	184,088	67.0%	71.0%
Black	68,690	25.0	19.0
Puerto Rican	16,485	6.0	7.0
OTHER MINORITY	5,495	2.0	
Chinese,	817	0.3	0.9
American Indians, other Central & Far Eastern Asians	2,148**	0.8	0.9

* These numbers are approximate because they are based on percentages rather than statistics.

** These figures are included in the 5,495 "Other minority" category, which includes non-Puerto Rican, Spanish-speaking background persons. The data base for the percentages is 273,881, instead of 274,758, because the breakdown for the Chinese was available only for the smaller figure.

Derived from: New York City Commission on Human Rights, "The Employment of Minorities, Women and the Handicapped in City Government, a Report of a 1971 Survey," September 1973.

EXHIBIT O
Representation of Ethnic Groups by Job Category, New York City Government, 1971

Occupational classification	Total no. employees in classification	Black	Puerto Rican	Chinese	Other minority	White
Officials and administrators	11,060	20%	3%	*	*	76%
Professionals	86,547	16	2	*	2%	79
Technical workers	2,489	29	6	*	*	63
Inspectors and investigators	3,557	13	1	*	*	85
Protective service workers	52,581	12	2	*	*	86
Paraprofessionals	16,072	49	25	*	*	23
Clerical workers	35,771	39	6	*	*	55
Craftpersons	6,491	5	2	*	*	92
Operatives	5,611	24	10	*	*	65
Service workers	33,060	58	12	*	*	28
Laborers	21,319	17	8	*	*	74

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Source: Derived from New York City 1971 survey.

EXHIBIT P

Percentage of Minorities in New York City Agencies with 1,000 or More Employees, 1971

Agency	Total no. employees	Black & Puerto Rican	Black	Puerto Rican	Other Spanish Surnamed	Chinese	Other Minority
Health & Hospitals Corporation	40,646	65%	55%	10%	2%	*	3%
Housing Authority	11,312	57	38	19	*	*	*
Social Services Department (HRA)	23,237	50	44	6	2	*	*
Correction Department	3,381	46	43	3	1	*	*
Health Department (HSA)	5,962	43	36	7	1	*	2
Rent & Housing Maintenance Department (HDA)	2,349	38	25	13	*	—	*
Municipal Service Administration	3,917	35	32	3	*	*	4
Traffic Department (TA)	1,143	32	28	4	—	*	*
Triborough Bridge & Tunnel Authority	1,052	25	23	2	*	*	*
Board of Education	88,641	24	18	3	*	*	1
Finance Administration	2,043	21	18	3	*	*	1
Parks, Recreation & Cultural Affairs Administration	4,895	21	19	2	*	*	*
Office of the Comptroller	1,176	17	15	2	*	*	*
Sanitation Department & Administrative Services (EPA)	15,304	15	13	2	*	*	*
Police Department	35,310	13	10	3	*	*	*
Highways Department (TA)	2,954	10	8	2	*	*	1
Water Resources Department (EPA)	3,858	9	8	1	*	*	*
Fire Department	14,873	5	4	1	*	—	*

* Less than 0.5 percent

Derived from: New York City 1971 Survey; also Brooke Aronson Trent, interview in New York.

EXHIBIT R

New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation,
Effect of Work Force Reductions Since July 1, 1975 on Employees

Total no. employees June 30, 1975	Total whites	Total minorities	Total blacks	Total Hispanics	Total Asian
45,702	13,039	32,663	24,235	6,549	1,356
Percent change since July 1, 1975 —8.8%	—9.4%	—8.5%	—8.1%	—12.9%	—3.6%
*Proportionate impact	1.06	0.96	0.92	1.36	0.40

* Proportionate impact: 1 indicates group affected by layoffs in exact proportion to their presence in work force. Greater than 1 indicates adverse impact. Less than 1 indicates group less affected by layoffs than the overall average.

Source: New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, Jan. 12. 1977.

of the city hospitals. Tania Azores, a member of the Asian-American Caucus, said:

> The New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation comes to Asia to recruit licensed nurses for the hospitals. Their knowledge and expertise are needed for the care of patients. Yet in hostile communities, they are accused of taking jobs away from white Americans. In other communities, they are used as scapegoats against other minorities.[48]

Samson Kwok, manpower specialist for the Chinatown Planning Council, told the Advisory Committee of his experiences in attempting to place an Asian nurse in a municipal hospital.

> ***our referral was met by the insensitive, non-thinking bureaucratic type responses. She had no New York license, thus was ineligible, plus because she is a new immigrant they didn't even bother to inquire about her experience; she was thus not qualified for a nurse position***[and] cannot work as the bed pan maintainer, nurse's aide or practical nurse. Furthermore, there was no help from the hospital to help her obtain a license.[49]

A more general problem discussed in relation to employment in the health fields was the process of certification for foreign-trained doctors. All foreign-educated doctors must be certified by the Educational Council for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG), a private nonprofit corporation operated by the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the American College of Physicians and Surgeons.[50] Although many foreign-educated medical doctors take the ECFMG examination before coming to the United States, others accept appointment to a nonaccredited hospital with the hope of passing the examination after their arrival. Donald Gin-Ming Wong told Commission staff that "many work at low level hospital positions, below the level of their skills and experience, and, accordingly, are often exploited by hospitals and clinic staff who assign them duties usually given to practicing physicians."[51] No public funds or training programs are available, and many find that the cost of taking medical and related refresher courses is beyond their means.

Pharmacists

Since 1965 the number of foreign-educated pharmacists admitted to the United States has steadily increased, with the majority coming from Asia. In 1970 614 foreign-educated pharmacists were admitted under occupational preferences, of whom 408 (or 66.4 percent) were from Asia. In 1973, 1,303 foreign-educated pharmacists were admitted; 1,100 (or 84.4 percent) were from Asia. Most were from Korea and the Philippines.[52]

Because New York is one of two States that permit foreign graduates to become licensed for the practice of pharmacy, many foreign-educated pharmacists come to New York. To obtain a license a graduate of a foreign pharmacy program must have completed 3 years of professional study in the U.S. or abroad and received a diploma from a school whose program meets standards satisfactory to the State education department. A candidate must serve a 1-year internship in New York and pass the State license examination which is given by the State board of pharmacy.[53]

All pharmacies that dispense 5,000 or more prescriptions per year may serve as internship sites. Although approximately 4,000 pharmacies in New York may train interns, internships are difficult to obtain. Dr. Albert J. Sica, executive secretary of the New York State Board of Pharmacy, wrote to Commission staff that "because of the tremendous enrollments in the colleges of pharmacy, internships are difficult to find, particularly in New York City."[54] The New York State Board of Regents currently does not accept an internship in a foreign country as an equivalent for the 12-months internship requirement in the State.

Dr. Sica wrote:

> Other States do permit the foreign graduate to engage in an internship but do not provide for licensure. If all States became involved in the licensure of graduates of foreign pharmacy programs, the problem of the assimilation of those graduates would disappear.[55]

Federal law requires that all interns receive the minimum hourly wage. Several persons testified that interns frequently did not receive salaries above the Federal minimum and did not earn enough to support their families. Rev. Ty Shin, an associate for social welfare of the Ministries of the United Presbyterian Church, said that many foreign interns took second jobs during their internships and did not have time to study for their examinations.[56]

According to the New York State Board of Pharmacy, since 1970 the number of foreign-educated candidates taking the examination has mar-

kedly increased. The number of foreign-educated pharmacists grew from 320 (or 29.2 percent) of the total in 1973 to 593 (or 39.6 percent) in 1974. The board estimates that approximately 80 percent of the foreign-educated candidates are Asian Americans.[57]

Notes to Chapter 4

1. See chapter 2 of this report where this figure is supported on the basis of both an undercount of Asians in the 1970 census and the immigration since 1970.

2. Betty Lee Sung, *Chinese American Manpower and Employment* (1975). A report prepared for the Manpower Administration (renamed the Employment and Training Administration in November 1975) of the U.S. Department of Labor under research and development grant no. 21-36-73-13 (hereafter cited as Sung study).

3. Urban Associates, Inc., *A Study of Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics* (July 1974), pp. 105-14. Study based on the 1970 census and funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Urban Associates is now known as R.J. Associates, Inc.

4. Chi-Wing Ho, "Some Findings of the National Asian American Field Study to the New York Advisory Committee," p. 8. The study received funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Available in the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office (NERO).

5. New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Transcript of Public Hearing, June 12-14, New York City, N.Y., vol. II, pp. 51-52 (hereafter cited as Transcript). Available in the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office (NERO) files.

6. The pole ordinance was passed in California to prevent the carrying of laundry on bamboo poles. Most Chinese laundries in the West used this method (a custom carried over from China) of carrying wet wash during the boom years of this industry.

7. Transcript, vol. II, p. 56.

8. Ibid., pp. 57-58.

9. Ben Fee, business agent, ILGWU, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 3, 1974 (hereafter cited as Fee Interview). At the time of the Committee's hearing, Mr. Fee was the highest ranking Asian American in the ILGWU.

10. Transcript, vol. II, p. 75.

11. Fee Interview.

12. Shelley Appleton, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 10, 1974.

13. Transcript, vol. II, p. 60.

14. Ibid.

15. New York State Employment Service, Attachment I, statement submitted to the New York State Advisory Committee, July 11, 1974.

16. Saul Volin, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., July 9, 1974. According to Mr. Volin, ILGWU has played an active role in promoting insurance benefits for its workers. During periods of layoffs in the garment industry, he said, Chinese women represent as much as 15 percent of the claimants at the two offices.

17. Act of 1973, Pub. L. 93-203, 87 Stat. 839.

18. 29 U.S.C. §801 (1973).

19. Lucille Rose, commissioner, New York City Department of Employment, telephone interview, Aug. 2, 1975, and Aug. 11, 1976. Total CETA funding for New York City for fiscal year 1975 was $65,728,000, and for fiscal year 1976, $56,760,000.

20. Angela Cruz, co-chairperson, Asian American Caucus, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., July 18, 1976; Tomi Ogata, Japanese American Citizens League, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., July 20, 1976; and Y. Suk Ko, department of athletics, University of Hawaii, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., July 20, 1976.

21. Paul Chin, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., Aug. 5, 1975.

22. Frank Haughton, Acting Chief, Research Branch, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, letter to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, Northeastern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Nov. 18, 1976.

23. Asian Americans for Equal Employment, statement submitted to the New York State Advisory Committee, July 11, 1974. Available in NERO files. Also, David Wong, Recruitment and Training Program, Inc., telephone interview, July 20, 1976. Mr. Wong said that 30 Asians responded to radio and television advertisements for a plasterer. "So you can't say that Asians are not interested in the building trades," he said. See also Sung study, p. 190.

24. Transcript, vol. II, p. 163.

25. Ibid., pp. 164-75.

26. James McNamara, New York City Office of Contract Compliance, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 22, 1974.

27. Transcript, vol. II, pp. 170-72.

28. James McNamara, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 10, 1974.

29. Transcript, vol. II, p. 157.

30. Rios vs. Enterprise Association, Steamfitters Local No. 638 U.A., 360 F. Supp. (2d Cir. 1974).

31. RTP is a federally-funded, nonprofit agency that recruits and trains minorities for construction trades.

32. Transcript, vol. II, pp. 175-76.

33. Harold Lui and Fay Chew, board members, Asian Americans for Equal Employment, Inc., staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 10 and 12, 1974.

34. Eleanor Telemaque, EEO Specialist, memorandum to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, NERO, June 13, 1974.

35. Takashi Yanagida, Asian Americans for Equal Employment, Inc., telephone interview, Oct. 9, 1974.

36. Alphonse M. DeMatteis, letter to U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 10, 1974. Mr. DeMatteis did not indicate how many of the 20 Asians were trainees or journeymen or how many were laborers or incidental workers.

37. The Advisory Committee is aware that the Asian population in Albany, where many State agencies are located, is small. However, the Committee believes that State government has the responsibility to recruit statewide and attract Asians to Albany for jobs.

38. New York State Department of Civil Service, "Occupations, Job Status and Ethnic Characteristics of Employers in New York State Agencies, Annual Report" (1974).

39. New York City Commission on Human Rights, "The Employment of Minorities, Women, and the Handicapped in City Government" (September 1973).

40. Tino Calabia, Tania Azores, and Angela Cruz, Asian American Caucus, staff interviews, New York City, N.Y., July 9, 1975.

41. Sung study, p. 172.

42. New York City Commission on Human Rights, "City Layoffs: The Effect on Minorities and Women" (April 1976).

43. Victor Solomon, director, office of equal opportunity, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, letter to Eleanor Telemaque, May 14, 1976.

44. Transcript, vol. II, pp. 223–35.

45. John L.S. Holloman, president, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, letter to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, Northeastern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Jan. 12, 1977. Further, Dr. Holloman states, as of June 30, 1974, Asian Americans made up 13.3 percent of those making over $45,000 a year.

46. Barbara Johnson, director of professional recruitment, New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 8, 1974.

47. Ibid.

48. Tania Azores, Asian American caucus, staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 20, 1974 and Mar. 10, 1975.

49. Transcript, vol. II, p. 87.

50. Ibid., pp. 203–04.

51. Donald Gin-Ming, M.D., staff interview, New York City, N.Y., June 3, 1974.

52. See *A Dream Unfulfilled: Korean and Pilipino Health Professionals in California* (May 1975). A Report of the California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

53. Albert Sica, executive secretary, New York State Board of Pharmacy, telephone interview, Sept. 2, 1974, and letter to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, Nov. 24, 1976.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. Transcript, vol. II, pp 94–96. Also, Rev. Ty Shin, Social Welfare Associate of the Ministries of the United Presbyterian Church, telephone interview, June 13, 1974.

57. Albert Sica, executive secretary, New York State Board of Pharmacy, telephone interview, Sept. 2, 1974, and letter to Jacques Wilmore, Regional Director, Nov. 24, 1976.

Chapter 5

The Asian as a Stereotype

> Chinky, chinky Chinaman; sitting on a fence; trying to make a dollar of fifteen cents.

This childhood nursery rhyme is one example of the traditional attitude of society towards the Asian American. Because attitudes may be the beginning of racial prejudice, the New York State Advisory Committee looked at the images and stereotypes of the Asian as portrayed in the media. The Advisory Committee also considered the extent to which Asian underrepresentation in the media work force perpetuated stereotyping of all Asian Americans.

Asian Stereotypes

A number of different, sometimes conflicting, stereotypes have been applied to Asians in the United States. One stereotype is that of a hard-working, obedient person who works long hours in a restaurant or laundry and needs no help or assistance from the American Government or its institutions—in other words, "he takes care of his own." A second sterotype is that of the "inscrutable Oriental," brilliant, crafty, and often a master detective such as Charlie Chan. A third, a stereotype of the Asian woman, is that of a sleek and seductive sex kitten.

Another stereotype is that of the sneaky, "slant-eyed" individual, a foreigner who is not to be trusted. This stereotype originated in the 1860s after the completion of the transcontinental railroad and was prevalent during World War II.

In the 1800s employers pitted the emerging white unions against Chinese worker who were frequently hired to break the strikes. This image of the Asian as a threat to labor has continued to the present day. Dr. Michio Kaku, chairperson of Asians for a Fair Media, pointed out that, in 1973 and 1974, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU) posted subway advertisements featuring the American flag with a "made in Japan" label with the byline, "Has your job been exported to Japan? If not, it soon will be." Dr. Kaku felt that behind this ad was the thinly veiled hint that cheap labor from Japan was creating unemployment in America. "Again the Asian American is being used as a scapegoat for complex economic ills, when in actuality, it is the United States corporations that are going overseas in search of cheap labor," he said.[1] In reply to Dr. Kaku's statement, Shelley Appleton, ILGWU vice president, stated that the subway poster had been withdrawn.[2]

The Media and Stereotypes

During the Advisory Committee's hearing, representatives from three private groups—Asian Coalition, Inc.,[3] Japanese American Citizens League,[4] and Asian Americans for a Fair Media[5] —alleged that the media were in large part responsible for perpetuating the Asian stereotypes. They documented a history of what they considered to be racist treatment of Asians in the media.

Several persons pointed to World War II to illustrate the power of the media in establishing stereotypes. Dr. Michio Kaku noted:

> The brutal treatment of Asian Americans during World War II is a concrete example of how the media, in a few short weeks, deliberately whipped up a vicious media campaign of war hysteria against the Japanese people, which ultimately led to the incarceration of 110,000 Japanese Americans (many of them American citizens) into concentration camps***. In an impressive display of power, the media overnight transformed the media image of Japanese as being crafty, sneaky, vicious, hungry after white women, and diabolical***.Almost overnight, comic books and popular magazines depicted the Japanese as myopic, cruel, stunted, bucktoothed, savage animals with pointed heads and limited vocabularies, marching into battle yelling "Banzai." During the Korean War, virtually the same stereotypes were conveniently resurrected to describe the Chinese people***and Asian; during the Vietnam war, we saw the tired images of Asians as "gooks" and "SLA" slants who cruelly defended their homeland by torturing the American invaders.[6]

The Broadcast Media

The Asian American community was critical of the broadcast media's portrayal of the Asian American. Asian Americans for a Fair Media (AAFME) presented 15 exhibits of what it termed "stereotyping in the media."[7] The group cited the following examples:

1. A handsome Caucasian wearing a Van Heusen shirt walks off with an Asian woman. The representative of Asian Americans for a Fair Media commented, "Why can't a handsome Asian man walk off with the Asian woman?" A similar ad publicized Old Spice toiletries.
2. A Chinese family eats what is obviously "Kentucky Fried Chicken." The Chinese girl says, "I don't think I'm going to be hungry an hour later." One implication, AAFME said, is that Chinese are critical of Chinese food.
3. A Chinese cook, with what Asian Americans for a Fair Media called a "very bad accent," sells Chun King Chop Suey.[8] The ad perpetuates the stereotype of the Asian as a cook who speaks poor English.
4. An ABC-TV movie about a white woman who married a Japanese man during World War II is entitled "My Husband, The Enemy," perpetuating the stereotype of the militaristic Japanese.
5. According to AAFME, there were no Asian children on "Sesame Street."

Documentaries, according to exhibits presented by Asian Americans for a Fair Media, also stereotype Asians. Frank Ching, then managing editor of *Bridge* magazine, a Chinese American quarterly, challenged two news documentaries on Chinatown broadcast by New York City's local channel 5 in 1974. In a letter to the station, he wrote:

> On two consecutive nights last week (May 16–17), WNEW-TV's 10 o'clock news contained segments on Chinatown that presented Chinatown as a hotbed of crime and communist spies. Such sensationalized reporting is extremely damaging to Chinese Americans and other Asian Americans, and it is irresponsible amd unworthy of a community-minded station. No members of the Chinese community were interviewed on camera. Was any attempt made to obtain a fairer picture of this particular story from responsible community organizations?[9]

The three major commercial networks, CBS, NBC, and ABC, and advertising agencies which held a substantial number of television commercial accounts were represented at the Advisory Committee's informal public hearing.[10]

Their spokespersons differed with the Asian community on what they considered stereotypes. The Asian community criticized an "Old Spice" commercial which depicted an attractive Asian woman obviously captivated by a white man. According to testimony from a representative of an advertising agency, the "Old Spice" commercial should not be considered offensive because it depicted an attractive young Asian woman with a white male. The point of the commercial, the representative said, was not that the woman was "Oriental," but that she was beautiful. Other agency representatives said that this commercial was one in a series which would show women from various countries.[11] The Asian community representatives suggested that an Asian male be used in the commercial with attractive women of several races pursuing him.

All network and advertising agency representatives who appeared before the Advisory Committee stated that there was no industrywide mechanism to gain comments from Asian communities on commercials. In a letter to the Advisory Committee, dated December 10, 1976, Raymond J. Maloney, Jr., director of public affairs for Batten, Barton, Durstine, and Osborn (BBD&O), wrote:

> Each agency we believe—does have a review board procedure which will prevent—as much as it is preventable—the production of commercials which will be found objectionable by any segment of the community. An industrywide mechanism would be inappropriate in this area.

However, Peter Greenman, account executive of BBD&O, said that the existing review process was adequate:

> We have no formal program to guide us in judging for ourselves whether we are committing an error of bad taste. I think meetings like this help, I guess, to raise our consciousness so that as these things come up, perhaps one gets more aware of things that one perhaps three years ago wouldn't realize was offensive.[12]

One network, CBS, does have a review mechanism. Drew Q. Brinkerhoff, vice president of personnel at CBS, described its function:

> The CBS Television Network's Program Practices Department is charged with responsibility of reviewing prior to broadcast all program material, other than news and public affairs materials, and commercials. Further, in instances where programming or commercials contain material offensive to minorities, Program Practices is empowered to require that such offensive material be deleted. Program Practices office is not limited to review of [the] final product prior to carriage by the network. In instances where programming and commercials are in preparation for presentation by the network, Program Practices' involvement in an advisory capacity, begins at the initial stages of preparation of the programs and commercials. Further, in connection with the appearance of minority group members on network programming, Program Practices assesses the roles played by such persons in order to assure that balanced portrayals are made of minority group members.[13]

The Brinkerhoff statement also indicated that there were no Asians employed in program practices.[14]

Following the informal hearing, in December 1974, George Dessart, director of public affairs for WCBS-TV, contacted Kazu Obayashi of AAFME to discuss the needs of the Asian American community. AAFME and the Oriental Actors of America stressed their concerns on stereotyping and the lack of Asian "input" in the "Six O'clock News" and in public affairs programming at WCBS-TV.[15]

Theater

According to Oriental Actors of America, stereotypes of Asian Americans have determined the roles played by Asians in radio, television, stage, and film. They alleged that the Asian American is never cast in a lead role. Charlie Chan had been acted in various productions by whites, and the hero of a recent series, "Kung-Fu," is not Asian. The second problem, Oriental Actors of America claimed, is that Asians are considered only for minor roles specifically written for Asians.

Alvin Ing of the Oriental Actors of America testified:

> Other minority groups have at last begun to overcome unfair employment patterns, condescending attitudes, and racial misrepresentations. No one in this country would dare to put on "blackface" any longer, and yet some producers do not hesitate to permit non-Asians to use "yellow face." Asian actors face the same problems as Asian construction workers. We are ignored or considered unqualified. And yet we are not given work to show that we are qualified. When we protest, the builders or the producers say, "Why are you complaining? Even the regular people aren't working." Then they proceed to give jobs to the "regular" people.[16]

In recent years, Asian actors and actresses have made only the smallest inroads into American theater. As indicated in exhibit Q, the percentage of Asian actors and actresses has grown from 0.2 percent in 1968 to 0.9 percent in 1972.

Mr. Ing said that Asian actors and actresses have unsuccessfully tried to break out of the stereotyping molds:

> The actors and actresses in our group have tried to make the casting directors and producers aware of the offensive nature of some of the scripts, and have been able to change them. But these opportunities are not presented to us very often.[17]

At the informal public hearing, the Oriental Actors of America presented a skit on "How to be a Good Asian."[18] The skit presented criticisms by the Asian community on the roles played by Asians and showed how stereotyping is perpetuated through casting.

Part of the skit shows students learning "how to be a good Asian." They are taught by the teacher to be inscrutable and to speak in "flowery never-ending speech patterns***or pidgin English." At the end of the skit when the students protest, they are told by the teacher, "Remember our image, stop acting like human beings."

To improve the representation of Asian actors and actresses in television commercials, Van Gie Hayes, casting director for Foote, Cone, and Belding, expressed a willingness to use Asian actors and actresses in "voice over" roles in commercials. Ad agencies in the past, she said, had held workshops for black actors and actresses, and she was willing to have her agency take the lead in such an endeavor.[19]

EXHIBIT Q
Employment of Asian American Actors and Actresses in New York City Theater, 1968–73

Season	Total employment	Employment of Asians	
		No.	Percent
1968–69	2,548	7	0.27
1969–70	2,196	5	0.17
1970–71	2,372	23	0.07
1971–72	2,202	10	0.45
1972–73	2,200	20	0.90

Source: Oriental Actors of America.

The Print Media

Asian spokespersons criticized the press for inadequate coverage and for covering only events such as the Chinese New Year and incidents which could be interpreted as "gang warfare."

A total of 14 newspaper clippings (1973 and 1974) were presented to the Advisory Committee by AAFME and the Japanese American Citizenship League(JACL).[20] In one clipping from the *New York Daily News*, a photograph accompanying the story "Chinatown Gang Members Shoot 5" gives the impression that a young Asian boy is one of the gang members. Actually, he is looking at the bullet hole after the shooting.[21] A daily feature (also in the *News*) is Ching Chow cartoons, which portrays Asians as buck-toothed "wise men with fortune cookie wisdom."[22]

Community spokespersons believed that, unless the print media increased the number of Asian reporters, stereotypes of the Asian community would persist. According to their testimony, accurate reporting of events concerning Asians is partly dependent upon employment of Asians.[23]

Although no comprehensive analysis of the employment picture in the print media was available to the Advisory Committee, testimony at the informal public hearing suggested that Asians comprise less than one-half of 1 percent of the total employment of the three major dailies in New York City. Furthermore, none of the major metropolitan newspapers employed any Asian reporters on their metropolitan or city desks. Two of the dailies (the *New York Post* and the *New York Daily News*) employed no Asian reporters.[24]

The *New York Times* did not send a representative to the informal hearing, but Ronald Inouye of the JACL discussed the failure of the *Times* to hire enough Asian staff to cover the Asian community. The departure of Frank Ching from the metropolitan desk of the *Times*, Mr. Inouye said, left the newspaper with no Asian reporters to cover the community. In a letter submitted to the Advisory Committee, N. R. Rosenthal, managing editor of the *New York Times*, pointed out that in 1974 one Japanese American, one Burmese American, and one Chinese American were employed.[25]

On October 10, 1974, the Newspaper Guild of New York filed suit in U.S. district court charging the *New York Times* with a "pattern and practice" of discrimination in violation of Federal statutes. One of the plaintiffs in the suit is Morgan Jin, the Asian American unit vice chairman of the Newspaper Guild at the *Times*. The individual complainants in the class action sought to represent "all non-white persons who are employed, who were employed or sought employment with the *Times*" at any time since July 2, 1965.

In an interview with Commission staff, Morgan Jin charged that three Asian employees (including himself) were demoted during an "economic" staff reduction at the newspaper, while whites with less education remained in their positions. Mr. Jin said that three high level jobs held by Asians were eliminated. The Asian employees had college degrees, Mr. Jin said, and could have been absorbed in other departments as standard operating procedure, yet they were all demoted.[26]

As of July 1977 no court decision has been rendered in this suit.

Allen Berg, assistant managing editor of the *New York Post* and Dr. Setsuko Nishi of the Advisory Committee discussed the *Post's* employment and affirmative action policies:

> Mr. Berg: I was just talking to my managing editor***. He says in his recollection he knows of no application for a job as a reporter or desk man from somebody who identified himself as an Asian American.
>
> Dr. Nishi: As we all know, from prior experience with any other minority groups as well, jobs which have been traditionally quite firmly closed to minority groups are not going to be applied for.
>
> Mr. Berg: I think that's a little innocent in this case.
>
> Dr. Nishi: I think we have to come to view this as something of an obligation on the part of those who are supposedly equal opportunity employers to vigorously recruit among those population groups which are insufficiently represented.
>
> Mr. Berg: Well, perhaps from your point of view, that's a priority. From my point of view, I would like to see aggressive people apply for jobs as reporters, people with skills, backgrounds, training, interest motivation."[27]

The Asian point of view was summed up by Kazu Obayashi of Asian Americans for a Fair Media:

Who speaks for our communities? Does the white media reporter know the structure of our communities (so as) to know what to look for? Often, we have no way of communicating. Certainly we need a sympathetic approach by a knowledgeable reporter and not one who thinks in terms of sensationalism.[28]

Notes to Chapter 5

1. New York State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Transcript of Public Hearing, June 12–14, 1974, New York City, N.Y., vol. I, pp. 209–10 (hereafter cited as Transcript). Available in the Commission's Northeastern Regional Office (NERO).

2. Shelley Appleton, vice president, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), telephone interview, June 10, 1974.

3. The Asian Coalition is a New York-based, nonprofit organization composed of Asian Americans interested in the civil rights of all minority groups. It is supported solely by volunteer workers and private contributions.

4. The Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), a private national organization with chapters in major cities in the United States, has campaigned extensively against movies made during World War II which picture the Japanese race in a disparaging light.

5. Asian Americans for a Fair Media is a New York-based, nonprofit organization set up to expose stereotyping and racism against Asians. Composed of unpaid volunteers, the group has monitored press, radio, and television for examples of stereotyping of Asians.

6. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 202–04.

7. Asian Americans for a Fair Media, Inc., N. Y., exhibit presented to Franklin Williams, Chairman, New York State Advisory Committee, June 12, 1974 (hereafter cited as AAFME exhibit). Available in NERO files.

8. According to interviews with network and advertising representatives present at the hearing, this particular commercial has been withdrawn following community protests. (June 10, 1974.)

9. Frank Ching, telephone interview, July 10, 1974.

10. The agencies were: Batten, Barton, Durstine, & Osborn (BBD&O); Young & Rubicam; J. Walter Thompson; Dancer Fitzgerald Advertising; Foote, Cone & Belding, and Ted Bates & Co.

11. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 382–83.

12. Ibid., p. 353.

13. Ibid., pp. 304–05.

14. Ibid., p. 305.

15. Kazu Obayashi, Asians for a Fair Media, Inc., staff interview, New York City, N. Y., July 1, 1975.

16. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 265–66, 274–75.

17. Ibid.

18. Transcript, vol. I, p. 272; Alvin Ing and Kathy Okada Robin, "How to be a Good Asian," scenario on file in NERO.

19. Transcript, vol. I, p. 372; also Alvin Ing, telephone interview, June 4, 1974.

20. Asian Americans for a Fair Media (AAFME), statement presented to Franklin H. Williams, Chairman, New York State Advisory Committee, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 12, 1974. Available in NERO files.

21. *New York Daily News*, Aug. 17, 1973.

22. AAFME exhibit.

23. Asian Americans for Equal Employment, representatives Fay Chew, Harold Lui, and others, statement presented to Franklin H. Williams, Chairman, New York State Advisory Committee, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, July 11, 1974. Available in NERO files.

24. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 401–02.

25. Ibid., pp. 254–57.

26. Morgan Jin, staff interview, New York City, N. Y., Aug. 10, 1975.

27. Transcript, vol. I, pp. 403–05.

28. Ibid., p. 246.

Findings and Recommendations

Finding No. 1: The New York Advisory Committee finds that Asian Americans in New York are truly a "forgotten minority"; there are very little socioeconomic data on them; many private and public agencies do not classify Asians as a "minority," and, except for the Chinese, few programs are operated on their behalf. Governmental programs reviewed in general lacked the necessary understanding of and sensitivity to the historical and cultural background of individual Asian groups.

Recommendation No. 1: The President or the Congress of the United States should establish an Office of Asian American Affairs, with authority to advise Federal departments and agencies on any matter of concern to Asian Americans. The Office should have adequate staff to deal with each separate Asian community, and should act as a liaison between these communities and public and private agencies in the United States.

Recommendation No. 2: The Governor of the State of New York should appoint an advisor on Asian American affairs, who would report directly to him on extending and improving State services to Asian Americans. The Governor should ensure that the concerns of Asians are properly addressed by the State division of human rights. As a first step in implementing this program, the Governor should order that a report be submitted to him within 90 days with recommendations on how State services in general and the services of the division of human rights in particular to Asian Americans may be improved.

Recommendation No. 3: The mayor of New York City should immediately set up a special advisory committee to examine the problems of Asian Americans. The committee should be representative of the major Asian Americans groups in New York City. The committee should submit a report to the mayor within 90 days of appointment with recommendations for meeting the special problems of Asian Americans.

Social and Economic Problems

Finding No. 1: The Chinese population in the city face serious problems of poverty and economic insecurity. Although there are insufficient data to make a firm finding with respect to other Asian American groups, there are indications that these groups have similar social and economic problems. Public social service agencies reviewed by the Advisory Committee had not organized their resources in a manner which would enable them to meet the special needs of this segment of the population. While the Social Security Administration has taken some steps in this direction, more needs to be done. The city department of social services has not developed an effective outreach program to the Asian American population as indicated by low Asian participation rates in welfare programs.

Recommendation No. 1: Public and private social ser ice agencies in general, and the Social Security Ad ninistration and the New York City Department of Social Services in particular, should adopt measures and procedures to ensure that the Asian American population has full opportunity to avail itself of assistance programs. Measures should include, but not be limited to, the employment of Asian American staff at policymaking and operational levels (particularly in outreach and intake positions); the location of personnel in the Chinatown area; and the publication of forms and informational material in Asian languages. Laws and regulations and procedures which, because of historical and cultural factors, place Asian Americans at a disadvantage, should be amended or revised.

The Asian Immigrant:

Finding No. 1: The Chinese Exclusion Acts and other aspects of U.S. immigrant policy represent a legacy of discrimination against the Chinese and other Asians, which continues to stigmatize these groups.

Finding No. 2: The lack of Asian American staff in the district office of the Immigration and Natu-

ralization Service (INS), particularly on the legal and enforcement staffs, represents a major obstacle to the INS developing the kind of sensitivity to and understanding of Asian language and culture which are essential if that office is to provide adequate services to the Asian community.

Finding No. 3: Reports of harassment of Asians by INS enforcement agents, although unverified by the Advisory Committee, are so widespread among leaders and citizens of the Asian community as to constitute a serious need for a thorough investigation and remedial action. In addition, the lack of adequate legal representation for many Asians, particularly the indigent, places the rights of these persons in jeopardy.

Finding No. 4: Allegations of prejudicial attitudes on the part of visa officers overseas, coupled with the lack of Asian American staff in the visa office (particularly on the General Counsel's staff) and the absence of a law guaranteeing the right of review of decisions of overseas visa officers, constitute a serious problem.

Recommendation No. 1: In view of past discriminatory policies, Congress should consider granting amnesty for those undocumented aliens who have been in this country for at least 5 years and provide absolute amnesty for those 65 years and older.

Recommendation No. 2: The Immigration and Naturalization Service should undertake a vigorous affirmative action program to recruit and hire Asian personnel, particularly attorneys, enforcement officers, and intake personnel. In addition, Asian personnel should be employed to conduct an orientation program for current INS staff to acquaint them with the customs and culture of various Asian groups.

Recommendation No. 3: Congress should amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide due process procedures. In the interim, INS should revise its regulations and procedures to provide the maximum possible protection for the innocent.

Recommendation No. 4: The Visa Office of the U.S. Department of State should adopt a vigorous affirmative action program to recruit and hire Asian professionals in Washington, particularly in the General Counsel's office and overseas. In addition, a thorough training program should be instituted for visa officers in Asian countries to provide them with a fuller understanding of the culture of various Asian groups.

Recommendation No. 5: Congress should amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for an absolute review of decisions made by overseas visa officers.

Recommendation No. 6: Private and public foundations and other funding sources should consider providing financial assistance to Asian organizations and agencies which provide legal assistance to Asian Americans.

Employment—Traditional and Nontraditional Industries

Finding No. 1: Asian Americans are represented in the labor force of New York City in greater proportion (as compared to their population) than any other ethnic group, but many tend to be concentrated in low paying and economically insecure occupations. In one Chinatown sample, more than one-third of the males were employed as service workers and more than two-fifths of the females as operatives

Finding No. 2: The restaurant industry, hand laundries, and garment trades—all traditional employers of Asian Americans—are declining industries which can no longer provide sufficient employment for Asian American workers.

Finding No. 3: Training opportunities for Asian Americans, both classroom training and on-the-job training, have been insufficient in number and variety to meet the needs of a growing population and those displaced from jobs in traditional industries.

Finding No. 4: Based on statistics provided the Advisory Committee, Asian Americans are not adequately represented in federally-funded manpower services provided by the New York City Department of Employment.

Finding No. 5: In 1974 participation of Asian Americans in the building and construction trades in New York City was virtually nonexistent, even on the construction site for Chinatown's Confucius Plaza project. Demonstrations by Asians resulted in only minor improvements. Existing government requirements for affirmative action do not specifically require separate goals for individual minority groups such as Asians.

Recommendation No. 1: The city and State of New York should initiate major retraining pro-

grams to assist Asian Americans in industries which have traditionally been their major employers (restaurants, laundries, and the garment trades) to move into other occupations. A special city and State committee should be empaneled to assess this problem and to plan remedial programs.

Recommendation No. 2: The U.S. Department of Labor, the New York State Department of Labor, and the New York City Department of Employment should jointly ensure that Asian Americans are adequately represented at all levels of the staff of employment and training agencies and in the New York State Employment Service.

Recommendation No. 3: Federal, State, and city compliance agencies in the construction field, together with the board of urban affairs of the building and construction industry and assistance from such private agencies as the Recruitment and Training Program, should require goals for separate minority groups such as Asian Americans. An outreach and training program should be conducted to obtain Asian American candidates for construction jobs and trainee positions.

Employment—The State and City as Employers

Finding No. 1: The employment of Asian Americans by the State of New York in most departments and agencies was inadequate.

Finding No. 2: The employment of Asian Americans in civil service positions of the city of New York was disproportionately lower than their numbers in the labor force, and, except for the professional classification, they were underrepresented in all occupations.

Finding No. 3: Because of the large number of foreign-trained pharmacists from Asia, particularly those Korean-born and-trained, and the fact that New York is one of only two States to permit such persons to be licensed, many Asians are forced to accept the required internship at no salary. As a result, many foreign-trained pharmacists experience severe economic hardship.

Recommendation No. 1: The civil service and personnel departments of the State and city of New York should launch an affirmative recruiting drive to locate and employ additional Asian Americans at all levels and in all departments of government; particular attention should be directed to the reform and modification of any rules, regulations, and procedures which are not related to job performance and which may place Asian Americans at a disadvantage because of their language, history, or culture. In the implementation of this recommendation, priority should be directed to those agencies in the health and hospital fields and those related to the delivery of social services.

Recommendation No. 2: The New York State Board of Pharmacy should use its good offices with similar boards in other States to encourage those States that do not license foreign trained pharmacy graduates to change their policies. The U.S. Department of Justice, in the light of the experience of New York and one other State, should seek a court order declaring that the refusal of the remaining 48 states to qualify foreign-trained pharmacists for the licensing examination to be discrimination on the basis of national origin.

The Asian as a Stereotype

Finding No. 1: Historically and at the present time, the Asian American has been the victim of stereotyping which has depicted him or her variously as sneaky, vicious, and diabolical; or weak, subservient, and self-effacing; or conscientious, hard working, cheap labor, and a threat to the American standard of living. Asian women are often depicted as exotic, "super-sexy," and submissive love objects, and Asian men as subhuman warriors or the vanguard of the yellow hordes which seek to destroy civilization. According to testimony, often these stereotypes have been manipulated to suit the needs of American foreign policy.

Finding No. 2: The broadcast media has relied largely on "self-regulation" as a means of eliminating stereotypes, and has failed to involve sufficiently Asian American organizations in the process.

Finding No. 3: Asian American actors and actresses have seldom been cast in the lead role of an Asian character. These actors and actresses experience great difficulty in being hired to play standard roles in the legitimate theater and on film.

Finding No. 4: Testimony received indicated that the print media's coverage of the Asian community has contributed to the perpetuation of stereotypes by emphasizing the bizarre and by failing to give the legitimate activities of Asian communities adequate coverage.

Recommendation No. 1: Casting directors, advertising agencies, and the broadcast media should

establish a regular and continuing relationship with Asian American organizations in New York as a means of eliminating stereotypes and enhancing the positive portrayal of Asian Americans. A first step towards such a continuing relationship could be the establishment of a minority advisory committee to the New York State Association of Broadcasters. The minority advisory committee should include representatives from Asian organizations.

Recommendation No. 2: The major daily newspapers of New York City should make a special effort to employ Asian American reporters and editorial staff as one means of improving news coverage of the Asian American community.

NEW YORK CITY
HEALTH AND HOSPITALS CORPORATION
125 WORTH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10013

JOHN L. S. HOLLOMAN, JR., M.D.
PRESIDENT

12 January 1977

Mr. Jacques E. Wilmore
Regional Director
U. S. Commission on Civil Rights
Northeastern Regional Office
26 Federal Plaza, Room 1639
New York, New York 10007

Dear Mr. Wilmore:

This is in response to your request for my comments on "The Forgotten Minority: A Review of Problems Confronting Asian Americans in New York".

I commend you for the accuracy of the data you report on Asian Americans in the Health and Hospitals Corporation.

I've enclosed for your interest and use, three exhibits comprising more recent data on the Corporation's workforce than contained in your report.

You will note that Asian Americans have made major gains in the Corporation in the last two years. In 1974, as represented in your report, Asian Americans constituted 8.2% of Corporate employees earning $25,000 or more a year. As of 30 June 1974, they made up 13.3% of those making over $25,000 a year.

In other areas you may note the following gains:

	1974	1976
Officials/Administrators Category	1.4%	1.5%
Professional Category	8.2%	9.9%
Total Asian Americans in Workforce	3%	3.3%

While the period since 1974 has been marked by unprecedented layoffs of Corporate employees, exhibit 2 shows that as a group, Asian Americans in the Corporation have been the least adversely affected of all groups. This is partly explained by our Affirmative Action efforts, and partly due to the concentration of Asian Americans in those categories where fewest layoffs have occurred.

Moreover, you will note from exhibit 3, that in titles referred to in your report, e.g. Pharmacist Interne, the Corporation has very high utilization.

Finally, the Corporation maintains an active Affirmative Action program which has been very mindful of complying with the spirit of Title VI, in regards to insuring that our health facilities which service Chinese American communities are capable of meeting the language and cultural challenge presented.

Sincerely,

John L. S. Holloman, Jr., M. D.
President

Enclosures
JLSH/gcw

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1977 732-134/129